arXiv:1301.4724v1 [math.NT] 21 Jan 2013

SELMER GROUPS AS FLAT COHOMOLOGY GROUPS

KĘSTUTIS ČESNAVIČIUS

Abstract. Given a prime number p, Bloch and Kato showed how the p^∞-Selmer group of an abelian variety A defined over a number field K is determined by the p-adic Tate module T_pA. In general one cannot hope that the p^m-Selmer group of A would be determined by the $\bmod p^m$ Galois representation $A[p^m]$. We show, however, that this is the case if p is large enough. More precisely, we determine a finite explicit set of primes S depending on K and A, such that the p^m-Selmer group of A is determined by $A[p^m]$ for all $p \notin S$. To do this we observe that for such p, the p^m-Selmer group agrees with the flat cohomology group of the ring of integers of K with coefficients in the p^m-torsion of the Néron model of A. We give a Selmer-type description for this flat cohomology group in terms of local conditions, which, for $p \notin S$, agree with the local conditions defining the p^m-Selmer group and depend only on $A[p^m]$.

1. Introduction

Let A be an abelian variety of dimension g defined over a number field K, and let p be a prime number. Fix a separable closure $\overline{K}$ of K. Then the K-group schemes $A[p^m]$ of p^m-division points of A are determined by their associated $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$-representations $A[p^m](\overline{K})$, and one forms the *p-adic Tate module* $T_pA := \varprojlim A[p^m](\overline{K})$. Tate conjectured [Tat66, p. 134] that T_pA determines A up to an isogeny of degree prime to p, and Faltings proved this in [Fal83, §1 b)][1]. More generally, one can ask whether $A[p](\overline{K})$ alone determines A to some extent. Consideration of the case $g = 1$, $p = 2$ shows that if p is small one cannot expect to prove much in this direction. However, at least if $g = 1$ and $K = \mathbb{Q}$, for p large enough (depending on A) the Frey-Mazur conjecture [Kra99, Conjecture 3] predicts that $A[p](\overline{K})$ should determine A up to an isogeny of degree[2] prime to p.

Consider now the p^∞-Selmer group $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K) \subset H^1(K, A[p^\infty])$, which consists of the classes of cocycles whose restrictions lie in the image $A(K_v)\otimes\mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p \subset H^1(K_v, A[p^\infty])$ of the Kummer map for every place v of K. Note that $A[p^\infty](\overline{K}) = \varinjlim A[p^m](\overline{K}) = V_pA/T_pA$, where $V_pA := T_pA\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}\mathbb{Q}_p$, so T_pA determines the Galois cohomology groups appearing in the definition of $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K)$. Since an isogeny of degree prime to p induces an isomorphism of p^∞-Selmer groups, the theorem of Faltings mentioned above implies that T_pA also determines $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K)$ up to an isomorphism. One may expect, however, a more direct and more explicit description of $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K)$ in terms of T_pA. For this it suffices to give definitions of the subgroups $A(K_v) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p \subset H^1(K_v, A[p^\infty])$ in terms of T_pA.

Date: January 22, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11G10; Secondary 14F20, 14K02, 14L15.

Key words and phrases. Abelian variety, Selmer group, fppf cohomology, torsor, Néron model, finite flat group scheme.

[1] By [Tat66, Lemmas 1 and 3], the quoted result by Faltings implies the bijectivity of $\mathbb{Z}_p \otimes \mathrm{Hom}(A, B) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)}(T_pA, T_pB)$ for all abelian varieties A, B over K. In particular, if $\iota\colon T_pA \xrightarrow{\sim} T_pB$, one can find an isogeny $\phi\colon A \to B$ whose reduction $\bmod p$ agrees with $\iota \bmod p$, hence $p \nmid \deg\phi$.

[2] The condition on the degree can be added, because by [Zar85, Theorem 1], up to isomorphism there are only finitely many abelian varieties B isogenous to A over K.

In [BK90] Bloch and Kato found the desired definitions: if $v \nmid p$, then $A(K_v) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p = 0$; if $v \mid p$, then, letting B_{cris} be the crystalline period ring of Fontaine and working with the Galois cohomology groups formed with continuous cochains in the sense of [Tat76, §2], they define

$$H^1_f(K_v, V_pA) := \mathrm{Ker}(H^1(K_v, V_pA) \to H^1(K_v, V_pA \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_p} B_{\mathrm{cris}})),$$

and then prove that

$$A(K_v) \otimes \mathbb{Q}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p = \mathrm{Im}(H^1_f(K_v, V_pA) \to H^1(K_v, V_pA/T_pA) = H^1(K_v, A[p^\infty])).$$

Considering the p-Selmer group $\mathrm{Sel}_p(A/K)$ and $A[p]$, instead of $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K)$ and $A[p^\infty]$ (equivalently, $\mathrm{Sel}_{p^\infty}(A/K)$ and T_pA), in light of the Frey-Mazur conjecture, one may expect a direct definition of $\mathrm{Sel}_p(A/K)$ in terms of $A[p]$ for large enough p. The goal of this paper is to give such a definition, proving in particular that for large p the p-Selmer group depends only on $A[p](\overline{K})$. In fact, we prove the more general

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 7.10)**.** *Fix an extension of number fields L/K. Let $\phi\colon A \to B$ be an isogeny between abelian varieties over K satisfying*

- *(i) A has good reduction at all places v of K such that $v \mid \deg\phi$,*
- *(ii) $\deg\phi$ is prime to $\prod_{w\nmid\infty} c_{A,w}c_{B,w}$, where $c_{A,w}$ and $c_{B,w}$ are the local Tamagawa factors of A and B over L_w and w runs over all the finite places of L,*
- *(iii) For every rational prime p with $p \mid \deg\phi$, one has $e_p < p-1$, where $e_p := \max_{v|p} e_v$ and e_v is the absolute ramification index of the nonarchimedean place v of K.*

Then the ϕ-Selmer group $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L) \subset H^1(L, A[\phi])$ is determined by the $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/K)$-module $A[\phi](\overline{L})$. In fact, the local conditions defining $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L) \subset H^1(L, A[\phi])$ vanish at the archimedean places, and for nonarchimedean w are given by the unramified cohomology subgroup

$$H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(L_w, A[\phi]) \subset H^1(L_w, A[\phi]), \text{ if } w \nmid \deg\phi, \text{ and by}$$

$$\mathrm{Im}(H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_w, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}) \to H^1(L_w, A[\phi])) \subset H^1(L_w, A[\phi]), \text{ if } w \mid \deg\phi,$$

where, if $w \mid v$ and $\mathcal{O}_w$ and $\mathcal{O}_v$ are the corresponding rings of integers of local fields, then $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$ is the base change to $\mathcal{O}_w$ of the unique finite flat $\mathcal{O}_v$-group scheme $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ with the generic fiber $A[\phi]_{K_v}$.

Remark 1.2. Theorem 1.1 is a stronger result than the one obtained by restricting to the case $L = K$. The reason for this is that the analogue of (iii) may fail for L, even though it holds for K. Note also that this comes at the expense of $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L)$ being determined by $A[\phi](\overline{L})$ as a $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/K)$-module, rather than as a $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/L)$-module.

Remark 1.3. Even though $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is characterized by a uniqueness property, it can be given a concrete definition. Let $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}$ be the homomorphism between the Néron models of A and B over $\mathcal{O}_K$ extending ϕ, and let $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ be its kernel. Then, as is suggested by the notation, $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is the base change of $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ to $\mathcal{O}_v$. Also, $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$ can be described directly: it is the kernel of the homomorphism induced by ϕ between the Néron models of A and B over $\mathcal{O}_w$. These claims are argued in the course of the proof of Theorem 7.10.

Remark 1.4. It is easy to check whether a given tuple (K, L, A, B, ϕ) verifies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Moreover, Theorem 1.1 lets one determine an explicit finite set of rational primes S depending only on K, L, A, and B, such that $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L)$ is determined by the $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/K)$-module $A[\phi](\overline{L})$ whenever $\deg\phi$ is not divisible by any prime in S. Namely, let S consist of all primes lying below a place of bad reduction for A (or B), all primes dividing a nonarchimedean local Tamagawa factor of $A \times_K L$ or $B \times_K L$, the prime 2, and all odd primes p that are ramified in K for which

$e_p \geqslant p-1$ (since $e_p \leqslant [K:\mathbb{Q}]$, one can just include all the primes $p \leqslant [K:\mathbb{Q}]+1$ for simplicity). Taking $K = L$ and $A = B$ yields the set S promised in the abstract.

Without additional effort we also obtain the corresponding result in the function field case:

Theorem 1.5 (Theorem 7.8). *Fix a global field K of positive characteristic. Let $\phi\colon A \to B$ be an isogeny between abelian varieties over K satisfying*

(i) $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$,

(ii) $\deg\phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_v c_{A,v}c_{B,v}$*, where* $c_{A,v}$ *and* $c_{B,v}$ *are the local Tamagawa factors of A and B over K_v and v runs over all places of K.*

Then the ϕ-Selmer group $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/K) \subset H^1(K, A[\phi])$ *is determined by the* $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$*-module* $A[\phi](\overline{K})$*. In fact, it consists precisely of the everywhere unramified cohomology classes of* $H^1(K, A[\phi])$*.*

Remark 1.6. Theorem 1.5 is easier to prove than Theorem 1.1. The principal reason for this is that under its assumptions, there are no places of K of residue characteristic dividing $\deg\phi$. In fact, we prove in Proposition 6.10(f) that if a nonarchimedean place v of a global field K has residue field $\mathbb{F}_v$ and $\deg\phi$ is prime to $c_{A,v}c_{B,v}\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v$, then the local condition at v defining the ϕ-Selmer group is $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(K_v, A[\phi]) \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$. This is a generalization of a well-known lemma of Cassels [Cas65, Lemma 4.1], which draws the same conclusion under the additional assumption that v is a place of good reduction. If A is an elliptic curve and K is a number field, this generalization has also been observed by Schaefer and Stoll [SS04, Lemma 4.5].

Both Theorems 1.1 and 1.5 are local results. What has led to them is an outgrowth of Remark 1.6: since, if $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v \nmid \deg\phi$, the unramified subgroup is often the local condition at v defining the ϕ-Selmer group, perhaps there is a natural way to extend its definition to the cases $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v \mid \deg\phi$. Let $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}$ be the homomorphism between the global Néron models of A and B extending ϕ, and let $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ be its kernel. Assume that $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg\phi$ to make sure that $A[\phi]$ is étale over K, and hence to be able to work with Galois cohomology (cf. 6.1). Once one observes, as is done in Proposition 6.10(e), that for $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v \nmid \deg\phi$,

$$H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(K_v, A[\phi]) = \operatorname{Im}(H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \to H^1(K_v, A[\phi])), \tag{1}$$

a natural guess is that

$$\operatorname{Im}(H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \xrightarrow{a} H^1(K_v, A[\phi])) \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi]) \tag{2}$$

could be a desired generalization of the unramified cohomology subgroup. This is indeed the case, if, in addition to $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg\phi$, also A has semiabelian reduction at all v with $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v \mid \deg\phi$. We assume this for the rest of the introduction (if v is a place of non-semiabelian reduction with $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}_v \mid \deg\phi$, we do not know of a generalization satisfying all the desired properties). By Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 4.1, a is injective, so we can write $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$. Two questions arise:

1.7. What is the "Selmer" subgroup of $H^1(K, A[\phi])$ cut out by the local conditions (2) for all nonarchimedean v?

Answer: Let $S = \operatorname{Spec}\mathcal{O}_K$ be the spectrum of the ring of integers of K, if K is a number field, and let S be the smooth proper curve with function field K, if $\operatorname{char} K > 0$. Then, as argued in 7.2, the subgroup in question is $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset H^1(K, A[\phi])$.

1.8. How do the local conditions (2) compare with the images of the local Kummer homomorphisms $\operatorname{Im}\kappa_{\phi,v} \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$?

Answer: This is the subject of Proposition 6.8. In short, if the local Tamagawa factors $c_{A,v}$ and $c_{B,v}$ are prime to $\deg\phi$, then $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) = \operatorname{Im}\kappa_{\phi,v}$ inside $H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$.

In the setting of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5, due to (1), Remark 1.3, and the answers above, the local conditions defining the ϕ-Selmer group and $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ agree at all places, and we get:

Theorem 1.9 (Theorem 7.10)**.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1,* $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{A}'[\phi])$ *inside* $H^1(L, A[\phi])$*, where* $\mathcal{O}_L$ *is the ring of integers of* L *and* $\mathcal{A}'[\phi]$ *is the kernel of the homomorphism induced by* ϕ *between the Néron models of* A *and* B *over* $\mathcal{O}_L$*.*

Theorem 1.10 (Theorem 7.8)**.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.5,* $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ *inside* $H^1(K, A[\phi])$*, where* S *is the smooth proper curve with function field* K *and* $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ *is the kernel of the homomorphism induced by* ϕ *between the Néron models of* A *and* B *over* S*.*

Theorems 1.9 and 1.10 interpret Selmer groups as flat cohomology groups. Similar relations have been observed already in [Maz72]. However, the description of the flat cohomology groups in question by local conditions is new. In fact, as we prove in Theorem 5.3, for it to hold one can take other group schemes than $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ as coefficients in the cohomology groups (see Remark 5.6). For instance, if S is as in the answer to 1.7 and $\mathcal{G}$ is any commutative finite flat S-group scheme, then $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K)$ is "cut out by local conditions". Another reason, why an interpretation of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ as a "Selmer group" is important, is because it tends to give more precise results: for instance, the bounds of Proposition 7.5(a) are stronger than the ones obtained by similar computations over global bases.

Assume for simplicity that $L = K$ in Theorems 1.1 and 1.9. Then the ϕ-Selmer group is determined by $A[\phi]$; in addition, $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_K, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$, so it is also determined by the $\mathcal{O}_K$-group scheme $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$. Is $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ determined by $A[\phi]$? We do not know the answer. However, the Frey-Mazur conjecture hints that it may be positive: if ϕ is multiplication by a large enough p, then $A[p]$ should determine A up to an isogeny of degree prime to p, and hence also $\mathcal{A}[p]$ up to an isomorphism.

Closed flat subgroups of Néron models

In justifying the injectivity of a in (2), we prove a more general Theorem 1.11, which we now explain.

Let S be a connected *Dedekind scheme*, i.e., a connected Noetherian normal scheme of dimension $\leqslant 1$, and let $\operatorname{Spec} K$ be the generic point of S. For instance, S could be chosen as in the answer to 1.7 above. A *Néron model* $\mathcal{X}$ (of $\mathcal{X}_K$) is a separated, finite type, smooth S-group scheme satisfying the Néron property that the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}_S(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{X}) \to \mathrm{Hom}_K(\mathcal{Z}_K, \mathcal{X}_K)$ is bijective for every smooth S-scheme $\mathcal{Z}$. (See 2.1 and 2.2 for a more general discussion of these concepts.)

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an S-group scheme which is faithfully flat and locally of finite presentation (fppf). Then

Theorem 1.11 (Theorem 4.1)**.** *If* $\mathcal{G}$ *admits a closed immersion of* S*-group schemes* $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{X}$ *into a commutative Néron model, then* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K)$ *is injective.*

If $\mathcal{G}$ is commutative and finite flat over S, then, by Proposition 4.4, Theorem 1.11 gives no obstruction to $\mathcal{G}$ occurring inside a commutative Néron model, and we ask

Question 1.12 (Question 4.5)**.** *If $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$ is the spectrum of the ring of integers of a number field K, is every commutative finite flat S-group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ a closed subgroup of a Néron model of an abelian variety?*

Fix $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$ as in Question 1.12. Example 4.11, due to Brian Conrad, shows that Theorem 1.11, specifically the failure of the injectivity of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K)$, can be used to construct commutative separated quasi-finite étale S-group schemes $\mathcal{G}$ which are not closed subgroups of commutative Néron models over S. Consequently, if one allows quasi-finite $\mathcal{G}$ in Question 1.12, then the answer is negative. On the other hand, as argued in Proposition 4.8, the answer to Question 1.12 is positive if K has a unique place above p and $\mathcal{G}$ is of p-power order.

1.13. The contents of the paper. We begin by collecting several general facts concerning Néron models in §2 and proceed in §3 by proving various short exact sequences involving open subgroups of Néron models of abelian varieties. These give appropriate analogues of Kummer exact sequences, when one works with the Néron models. Injectivity of a in (2), or, more precisely, Theorem 1.11 generalizing it, is proved in §4, which also discusses Question 1.12. In §5 we prove the main technical result (Theorem 5.3) giving a description of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ in terms of local conditions. The work of previous sections is used in §6, where over a local base we investigate the relations between $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v}$, $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v})$, and the unramified cohomology subgroup. This analysis is used in §7 to compare the ϕ-Selmer group and $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ and to prove Theorems 1.1, 1.5, 1.9 and 1.10. For cross-reference purposes, we gather several well-known results from algebraic geometry in Appendix A.

1.14. Conventions. For a field K, we denote by $\overline{K}$ a separable closure of K, a choice of which will always be made implicitly; so will be a choice $K^{\mathrm{alg}} \supset \overline{K}$ of an algebraic closure. If K is a global field and v is one of its places, a choice of an embedding $\overline{K} \hookrightarrow \overline{K_v}$ is also made implicitly. For a scheme S and a point $s \in S$, we denote by $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\mathfrak{m}_{S,s}$, and $k(s)$ the local ring of S at s, its maximal ideal, and its residue field. We denote by S_{fppf}, $S_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$, and $S_{\mathrm{\acute{E}t}}$ the fppf, big étale, and étale sites of S; the objects of S_{fppf} and $S_{\mathrm{\acute{E}t}}$ are all S-schemes, while those of $S_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$ are all schemes étale over S. The cohomology groups computed in $S_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}$ and S_{fppf} are denoted by $H^i_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ and $H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$; usually $\mathcal{G}$ will be represented by a commutative S-group algebraic space locally of finite presentation. Galois cohomology groups will be denoted by H^i, and, for $\mathcal{G}$ as above, the δ-functorial identification $H^i_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(K, \mathcal{G}) \cong H^i(K, \mathcal{G}(\overline{K}))$ arising from a choice of $\overline{K}$ will be made implicitly. So will be the identification $H^i_{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \cong H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ for smooth $\mathcal{G}$ satisfying the assumptions of Proposition A.2; it is δ-functorial as well. In the presence of a morphism $f \colon S' \to S$, it will be understood that $H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \to H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S', f^*\mathcal{G})$ is the δ-functorial pullback homomorphism; if $\mathcal{G}$ is an S-algebraic space, then $f^*\mathcal{G} \cong \mathcal{G} \times_S S'$. For an S-algebraic space X, we frequently use the shorthand X_T for its base change along $T \to S$. As is the usual practice in the abuse of notation, when dealing with affine schemes, such as $S = \operatorname{Spec} R$, $T = \operatorname{Spec} R'$, we sometimes drop Spec for brevity, e.g., we talk of an R-algebraic space X, and its base change $X_{R'}$.

We assume the definition [SP, Definition 025Y] of an algebraic space (see also [SP, Lemma 076M]). In particular, when citing results from other references, we sometimes have to make an additional quasi-separatedness assumption. Representability of torsors is our main reason for resorting to algebraic spaces, see Proposition A.4. The reader only interested in the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.5, 1.9 and 1.10 can restrict to the case of schemes: due to the quasi-affineness of $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$, the appearing torsors are schemes (see Corollary 3.10).

Acknowledgements. I thank Bjorn Poonen for many helpful discussions, suggestions, and for reading various drafts. I thank Brian Conrad for numerous suggestions that benefited the paper.

I thank Tim Dokchitser, Jessica Fintzen, Michael Stoll, and David Zureick-Brown for helpful conversations or correspondence regarding the material of this paper. The research presented here was carried out during the author's stay at the Centre Interfacultaire Bernoulli (CIB) in Lausanne during the course of the program "Rational points and algebraic cycles". I thank CIB, NSF, and the organizers of the program for a lively semester and the opportunity to take part.

2. Néron models

Our analysis of Selmer groups will be based on a study of Néron models of abelian varieties. This section is devoted to various concepts and results in the theory of Néron models. We set notation in 2.1 and 2.2, recall ways to recognize and construct Néron models in Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.8, and investigate their groups of torsors in Propositions 2.10 to 2.12.

2.1. Dedekind schemes. Recall that a *Dedekind scheme* S is a Noetherian normal scheme of dimension $\leqslant 1$. A normal Noetherian local ring of dimension $\leqslant 1$ is either a discrete valuation ring or a field, so these are also the possibilities for the local rings of S. We assume that S is connected; this is not necessary, but it simplifies the notation (though not the proofs). In particular, under this assumption, S is not the empty scheme. All our results can be deduced for arbitrary S from this special case by decomposing S into connected components.

We let K denote the function field of S. If $\mathcal{X}$ is an S-scheme, we call $\mathcal{X}_K$ the *generic fiber* of $\mathcal{X}$. Any nongeneric point of S is closed, and the complement of any nonempty open subscheme $U \subset S$ is a finite union of closed points. The main cases of interest are when S is a smooth proper curve, or when $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$ where $\mathcal{O}_K$ is the ring of integers of a number field or a nonarchimedean local field K.

For $s \in S$, let $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\mathfrak{m}_{S,s}$, and $k(s)$ be the local ring of S at s, its maximal ideal, and residue field. Denote by $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ the henselization, strict henselization, and completion of $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, respectively. The fraction fields of $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ will be denoted by $K_{S,s}$, $K^h_{S,s}$, $K^{sh}_{S,s}$, and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$, respectively. Note that $K_{S,s} = K$, and, if s is not the generic point, that $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$ is the completion of $K_{S,s}$ with respect to the discrete valuation corresponding to s. Also, $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ are either fields (if s is the generic point) or discrete valuation rings sharing a common uniformizer [BLR90, §2.3 Proposition 10]. In the latter case, the residue fields of $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ are the same (cf. [EGA IV_4, 18.6.6 (iii)] for $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$). Note that $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, $\operatorname{Spec} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$, and any nonempty open $U \subset S$ are also Dedekind schemes. The notation introduced here will be in place for the rest of the section.

2.2. Néron (lft) models. Recall that an S-group scheme $\mathcal{X}$ is a *Néron model* (of $\mathcal{X}_K$) if it is separated, of finite type, smooth, and satisfies the *Néron property*: the natural map $\operatorname{Hom}_S(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{X}) \to \operatorname{Hom}_K(\mathcal{Z}_K, \mathcal{X}_K)$ is bijective for every smooth S-scheme $\mathcal{Z}$. If one drops the condition that $\mathcal{X}$ be of finite type, one obtains the definition of a *Néron lft model* [BLR90, §10.1], which is locally of finite type because of smoothness. Of course, a Néron model is also a Néron lft model. Note that the Néron property determines $\mathcal{X}$ from $\mathcal{X}_K$ uniquely up to a unique isomorphism. In general, in the definitions above one does not need to require that $\mathcal{X}$ be a group; we do, however, because all the Néron (lft) models that will be of interest to us have this property.

Proposition 2.3.

(a) *If $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is a Néron model (resp., Néron lft model), and $U \subset S$ is a nonempty open, then $\mathcal{X}_U \to U$ is also a Néron model (resp., Néron lft model).*

(b) *A finite type (resp., locally of finite type) $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is a Néron model (resp., Néron lft model) if and only if, for every closed point $s \in S$, the base change $\mathcal{X} \times_S \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is a Néron model (resp., Néron lft model).*

(c) *Suppose that $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is local and $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is a Néron model (resp., Néron lft model). Then $\mathcal{X} \times_S \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$, $\mathcal{X} \times_S \operatorname{Spec} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$, and $\mathcal{X} \times_S \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s}$ are also Néron models (resp., Néron lft models).*

Proof.

(a) This results from the definitions.

(b) See [BLR90, §1.2 Proposition 4] and [BLR90, p. 290]. Note that this generalizes (a).

(c) This is a special case of [BLR90, §10.1 Proposition 3]. ☐

The following result is useful in recognizing Néron models:

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is a proper smooth S-group scheme. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is a Néron model.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.3(b), we can assume that S is the spectrum of a discrete valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$. Then by [BLR90, §7.1 Theorem 1], it suffices to check that $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{O}^{sh}_{S,s}) \to \mathcal{G}(K^{sh}_{S,s})$ is bijective. This results from the valuative criterion of properness. ☐

Another source of Néron models is Theorem 2.8 below. We now recall various concepts present in its formulation, which will also play a role elsewhere.

2.5. Schematic image and schematic dominance. For a morphism $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ of schemes, the *schematic image* of f is the closed subscheme $Y' \to Y$ through which f factors and which is initial among such closed subschemes of Y. By [SP, Lemma 01R6], the schematic image exists for any f. If for each open subscheme $U \subset Y$, the schematic image of the base change f_U is U, then f is *schematically dominant* [EGA IV$_3$, 11.10.2]. By [SP, Lemma 01R8], if f is quasi-compact, then the induced morphism $X \to Y'$ is schematically dominant. By [EGA IV$_3$, 11.10.5 (ii) a)], schematic dominance of a quasi-compact morphism f is preserved under flat base change, hence the formation of the schematic image of a quasi-compact f commutes with flat base change.

We recall (cf. 2.1) that S denotes a connected Dedekind scheme.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be an S-scheme, and let H be a closed subscheme of $\mathcal{Y}_K$.*

(a) *The schematic image $\mathcal{H}$ of $H \to \mathcal{Y}$ is the unique closed subscheme of $\mathcal{Y}$ which is S-flat with the generic fiber $\mathcal{H}_K = H$.*

(b) *If, in addition, $\mathcal{Y}$ is an S-group scheme, and H is a K-subgroup scheme, then $\mathcal{H}$ is an S-subgroup scheme of $\mathcal{Y}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}$ is killed by every n that kills H and is commutative, if so is H.*

(c) *In the setting of (b), if $\mathcal{Y} \to S$ is of finite type and H is a finite K-group scheme, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a quasi-finite fppf S-group scheme with $\mathcal{H}_K = H$; it is killed by $\#H$.*

Proof.

(a) This results from [EGA IV$_2$, 2.8.5].

(b) Using transitivity of schematic image [EGA I, 9.5.5], checking that various diagrams giving the group scheme structure of $\mathcal{Y}$ restrict to give the group scheme structure of $\mathcal{H}$ is straightforward once one knows that the schematic image of $H \times_K H \to \mathcal{Y} \times_S \mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathcal{H} \times_S \mathcal{H}$. This results from [EGA IV$_2$, 2.8.6]. The transitivity mentioned above also shows that $\mathcal{H}$ is killed by n, if so is H. The claim about commutativity results by using in addition [EGA I, 9.5.6].

(c) By (a) and (b), $\mathcal{H}$ is a flat S-group scheme with $\mathcal{H}_K = H$, and it is of finite type, because so is $\mathcal{Y}$. Thus, $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is fppf. By applying [BLR90, §2.4 Proposition 4] to the schematic images of the connected components of H (to meet the irreducibility condition in loc. cit.), the dimensions of the fibers of $\mathcal{H}$ are 0, so $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is quasi-finite. Since H is killed by $\#H$, the last claim results form (b). ☐

2.7. Group smoothenings. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a finite type S-group scheme with smooth generic fiber. Recall [BLR90, p. 174] that an S-morphism $\mathcal{G}' \xrightarrow{t} \mathcal{G}$ is a *group smoothening* (of $\mathcal{G}$) if $\mathcal{G}'$ is a finite type smooth S-group scheme and t is terminal among S-morphisms from smooth S-schemes $\mathcal{Z}$ to $\mathcal{G}$. That is, for any smooth $\mathcal{Z} \to S$, any S-morphism $\mathcal{Z} \to \mathcal{G}$ factors uniquely through t. If a group smoothening of $\mathcal{G}$ exists, it is unique up to a unique isomorphism. If $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is local, then $\mathcal{G}'_K$ and $\mathcal{G}_K$ are smooth over S, so, using the universal property, $\mathcal{G}'_K \xrightarrow{t_K} \mathcal{G}_K$ is an isomorphism.

Theorem 2.8 ([BLR90, §7.1 Corollary 6])**.** *Let $\mathcal{X} \to S$ be a Néron model, and let $G \subset \mathcal{X}_K$ be a closed subgroup which is K-smooth. Then G admits a Néron model, which is given by the group smoothening of the schematic image of $G \to \mathcal{X}$. Consequently, the schematic image of $G \to \mathcal{X}$ is the Néron model of G if and only if it is S-smooth.*

Proposition 2.9. *A finite étale K-group scheme G has a Néron model $\mathcal{G} \to S$, which is separated, quasi-finite, étale, and killed by every n that kills G.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{G}$ exists. By the definition of a Néron model 2.2 and Proposition 2.6, $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is separated, quasi-finite, smooth, and killed by every n that kills G. Since $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is quasi-finite, it is of relative dimension 0, so, due to smoothness, it is also étale [BLR90, §2.2 Proposition 11].

Let K'/K be a finite separable extension such that $G_{K'}$ is constant, hence has a Néron model. Let S' be the normalization of S in K'. The existence of $\mathcal{G}$ follows from [BLR90, §7.2 Proposition 4] once we show that S' is a Dedekind scheme and $S' \to S$ is finite flat. The latter follows from [Bou64, V.§1.6 Corollaire 1 de la Proposition 18], because flatness can be checked at the stalks of the base. It follows that S' is Dedekind because integral closure does not change the dimension. ☐

We now consider fppf torsors under $\mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is a commutative Néron (lft) model.

Proposition 2.10 ([Ray70, Théorème XI 3.1 1)])**.** *Let $\mathcal{X} \to S$ be a Néron model. Every fppf torsor under $\mathcal{X}$ is representable by a scheme.*

Proposition 2.11. *Let $\mathcal{X} \to S$ be a commutative Néron lft model. Then*

$$H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{X}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{X}_K) \overset{1.14}{\cong} H^1(K, \mathcal{X}_K) \tag{3}$$

is injective.

Proof. By A.3 and Proposition A.4, we need to show that if an algebraic space $\mathcal{T}$ is an fppf torsor under $\mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{T}(K) \neq \varnothing$, then $\mathcal{T}(S) \neq \varnothing$. We will define a desired $P \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ étale locally. Let $U \to S$ be an étale cover from Proposition A.5 trivializing $\mathcal{T}$. Then $\operatorname{Spec} K \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{T}$ gives rise to

$$p_U \in \operatorname{Hom}_U(U_K, \mathcal{T} \times_S U) = \operatorname{Hom}_U(U_K, \mathcal{X} \times_S U) = \operatorname{Hom}_S(U_K, \mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{Hom}_K(U_K, \mathcal{X}_K),$$

hence, invoking the Néron property for the smooth $U \to S$, to the unique

$$P_U \in \mathrm{Hom}_S(U, \mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{Hom}_U(U, \mathcal{X} \times_S U) = \mathrm{Hom}_U(U, \mathcal{T} \times_S U) = \mathrm{Hom}_S(U, \mathcal{T}).$$

Due to uniqueness, P_U gives rise to a descent datum relative to the cover $U \to S$, which, because $\mathcal{T}$ is an étale sheaf, produces a desired $P \in \mathcal{T}(S)$. ☐

If S is local and $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is a commutative Néron model, it is possible to identify the image of (3):

Proposition 2.12. *Let $S = \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ be the spectrum of a discrete valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a commutative Néron model over S. Then the image of the injection b from* (3) *is*

$$B := \mathrm{Ker}(H^1(K, \mathcal{X}_K) \to H^1(K^{sh}, \mathcal{X}_K)).$$

In other words, an fppf torsor T under $\mathcal{X}_K$ extends to a torsor under $\mathcal{X}$ if and only if $T(K^{sh}) \neq \varnothing$.

Proof. The inclusion $B \subset \mathrm{Im}\, b$ results from [BLR90, §6.5 Corollary 3] (with $R' = R^{sh}$). On the other hand, by Proposition A.5, any $\mathcal{X}$-torsor $\mathcal{T}$ trivializes over an étale cover U of S. Since $\mathrm{Spec}\, \mathcal{O}_{S,s}^{sh} \to \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ factors through U [BLR90, p. 48], $\mathcal{T}$ trivializes over $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^{sh}$, yielding $\mathrm{Im}\, b \subset B$. ☐

Remark 2.13. If $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is the ring of integers of a nonarchimedean local field K, then K^{sh} is the maximal unramified extension of K, and B is the unramified cohomology subgroup of $H^1(K, \mathcal{X}_K)$. Consequently, for a commutative Néron model $\mathcal{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, by Propositions 2.11 and 2.12, $H^1_{\text{ét}}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, \mathcal{X}) \overset{1.14}{\cong} H^1_{\text{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, \mathcal{X}) \subset H^1(K, \mathcal{X}_K)$ is the unramified cohomology subgroup.

3. EXACT SEQUENCES INVOLVING OPEN SUBGROUPS OF NÉRON MODELS OF ABELIAN VARIETIES

3.1. The setup. Assume the framework of 2.1. Hence, S is a connected Dedekind scheme with the function field K. Let $A \xrightarrow{\phi} B$ be an isogeny between abelian varieties over K, let $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}$ be the induced homomorphism between their Néron models over S, and let $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ be its kernel. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is separated, the unit section $S \to \mathcal{B}$ is a closed immersion, hence so is $\mathcal{A}[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}$. For $s \in S$, we denote by ϕ_s the homomorphism obtained from ϕ by the base change to the fiber at s. This setup will be in place for the remainder of the section.

If $\mathrm{char}\, K \nmid \deg \phi$, one often studies the long exact Galois cohomology sequence of

$$0 \to A[\phi] \to A \xrightarrow{\phi} B \to 0. \tag{4}$$

If one works with $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, the analogue of (4), stated in Proposition 3.12(a), faces complications due to the possibility of disconnected closed fibers. In this section we gather several short exact sequences which are useful when working with Néron models of abelian varieties. These sequences have been used repeatedly in the literature, but their proofs seem difficult to locate.

3.2. Open subgroups of $\mathcal{A}$. For a closed point $s \in S$, let Φ_s be the étale $k(s)$-group scheme $\mathcal{A}_s/\mathcal{A}_s^0$ of connected components of the special fiber $\mathcal{A}_s$ at s. Since $\mathcal{A} \to S$ is of finite type, Φ_s is finite; Φ_s gives rise to the finite $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k(s)}/k(s))$-module $\Phi_s(\overline{k(s)})$. For each s, choose a subgroup scheme Γ_s of Φ_s (equivalently, a $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k(s)}/k(s))$-submodule $\Gamma_s(\overline{k(s)}) \subset \Phi_s(\overline{k(s)})$). For all s but finitely many, $\mathcal{A}_s$ is an abelian variety, hence $\Phi_s = 0$. Thus, regardless of the choices, $\Gamma_s = \Phi_s$ for all s but finitely many. Consequently, define the open subscheme $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma \subset \mathcal{A}$ obtained by removing for all s the connected components of $\mathcal{A}_s$ that are not in Γ_s. It follows from the construction that $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma$ is an open S-subgroup scheme of $\mathcal{A}$, and that for each S-scheme T, the sections in $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma(T)$ are those $T \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$, for which the composition of $f_s \colon T_s \to \mathcal{A}_s$ and $\mathcal{A}_s \to \Phi_s$ factors through $\Gamma_s \subset \Phi_s$.

Taking $\Gamma_s = 0$ for all s, one obtains the open S-subgroup scheme $\mathcal{A}^0$ of $\mathcal{A}$ that fiberwise consists of connected components of identity. Of course, taking $\Gamma_s = \Phi_s$ for all s, one gets $\mathcal{A}^\Phi = \mathcal{A}$. For $s \in S$, we denote the base change $(\mathcal{A}^\Gamma)_s$ by $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s$.

For a closed point $s \in S$, denote by $i_s\colon \operatorname{Spec} k(s) \to S$ the corresponding closed immersion. Since $i_s^* \mathcal{A}^\Gamma = \mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s$, under the adjunction $i_s^* \dashv i_{s*}$ the homomorphism $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s \xrightarrow{\pi_s} \Gamma_s$ gives rise to the homomorphism $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma \to i_{s*}\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s \xrightarrow{i_{s*}(\pi_s)} i_{s*}\Gamma_s$ of fppf sheaves, under which $f \in \mathcal{A}^\Gamma(T)$ maps to $\pi_s \circ f_s$. In particular, for any choice of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_s \subset \Gamma_s$, there is a Cartesian square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{A}^{\widetilde{\Gamma}} \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{A}^\Gamma \arrow[d] \\
\bigoplus_s i_{s*}\widetilde{\Gamma}_s \arrow[r, hook] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\Gamma_s.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let T be a scheme, and let $X \to T$ be a smooth T-algebraic space. If X is not a scheme, assume that it is quasi-separated. For a closed point $t \in T$, let $X_t \to \operatorname{Spec} k(t)$ be the base change of X along $i_t\colon \operatorname{Spec} k(t) \to T$. Then the natural map*

$$X \to i_{t*}i_t^* X = i_{t*}X_t$$

is a surjection of sheaves in the big étale site $T_{\text{Ét}}$ of T.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the coordinate ring of some stalk at a geometric point $o = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O},o}$ in $T_{\text{Ét}}$, so $\mathcal{O}$ is a strictly Henselian local ring. Since $X \to T$ is locally of finite presentation, by [SP, Definition 049J and Proposition 04AK], the stalk of X at o is $X(\mathcal{O})$. Similarly, since t is closed, the stalk of $i_{t*}X_t$ at o is $X_t(\varnothing)$, if o is not centered at t, and $X_t(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a}) = X(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$, if o is centered at t, where $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O},o}$ is the ideal generated by the image of $\mathfrak{m}_{T,t}$. In the latter case, the desired surjectivity of $X(\mathcal{O}) \to X(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$ follows from Lemma A.1. ☐

Proposition 3.4. *The sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{A}^0 \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma \to \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\Gamma_s \to 0$$

is exact in the étale, big étale, and fppf sites of S.

Proof. Taking $\widetilde{\Gamma}_s = 0$ for all s in (5) proves exactness in the middle. It remains to argue the surjectivity of $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma \to \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\Gamma_s$, which will follow in all the sites in question, if we show it for the big étale site. In addition, since the direct sum is finite and indexed over closed $s \in S$, it suffices to argue the surjectivity of each $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma \to i_{s*}\Gamma_s$. For this, we inspect the factorization $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma \xrightarrow{a} i_{s*}\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s \xrightarrow{b} i_{s*}\Gamma_s$, where a is surjective by Lemma 3.3. It remains to show that $\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s \xrightarrow{c} \Gamma_s$ is surjective in $(\operatorname{Spec} k(s))_{\text{Ét}}$, because i_{s*} is exact for the étale topology.

Inspecting a stalk in $(\operatorname{Spec} k(s))_{\text{Ét}}$ with the coordinate ring $\mathcal{O}$, since $\overline{k(s)} \subset \mathcal{O}$, we have a commutative square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s(\overline{k(s)}) \arrow[r, "c(\overline{k(s)})"] \arrow[d] & \Gamma_s(\overline{k(s)}) \arrow[d, "d"] \\
\mathcal{A}^\Gamma_s(\mathcal{O}) \arrow[r, "c(\mathcal{O})"] & \Gamma_s(\mathcal{O}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The map d is bijective, because $\Gamma_s \times_{k(s)} \overline{k(s)} = \bigsqcup \operatorname{Spec} \overline{k(s)}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ is local, whereas by limit arguments [EGA IV$_3$, 8.14.2], $c(\mathcal{O})$ is the map induced on the stalk. The surjectivity of $c(\mathcal{O})$

follows, because the surjectivity of $c(\overline{k(s)})$ is due to the fact that every component of $\mathcal{A}_s^\Gamma \times_{k(s)} \overline{k(s)}$ is smooth and therefore has a $\overline{k(s)}$-point [EGA IV$_4$, 17.16.3 (ii)]. ☐

More generally, we have

Proposition 3.5. *For any choice of subgroup schemes $\widetilde{\Gamma}_s \subset \Gamma_s$, the sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{A}^{\widetilde{\Gamma}} \to \mathcal{A}^{\Gamma} \xrightarrow{d} \bigoplus_s i_{s*}(\Gamma_s/\widetilde{\Gamma}_s) \to 0$$

is exact in the étale, big étale, and fppf sites of S.

Proof. Due to (5) and Proposition 3.4, in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}^0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{A}^{\widetilde{\Gamma}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\widetilde{\Gamma}_s \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}^0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}^{\Gamma} \arrow[r] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\Gamma_s \arrow[r] & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

the rows are short exact in any of the sites. In the case of the big étale site, each i_{s*} is exact by, hence the conclusion by snake lemma. This gives surjectivity of d in any of the sites, and also the conclusion, because left exactness is checked on the level of presheaves. ☐

Lemma A.10(a) and Proposition 3.5 give one way to prove

Corollary 3.6. *For any choice of subgroup schemes $\widetilde{\Gamma}_s \subset \Gamma_s$, the fppf sheaf $\bigoplus_s i_{s*}(\Gamma_s/\widetilde{\Gamma}_s)$ is representable by an algebraic space.*

We recall that the setup of 3.1 is in place.

Lemma 3.7. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) $\mathcal{A}^0 \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^0$ is quasi-finite;

(b) $\mathcal{A}^0 \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^0$ is surjective (as a morphism of schemes);

(c) $\mathcal{A}^0 \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^0$ is flat.

When the equivalent conditions above are satisfied, $\mathcal{A}^0 \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^0$ is a surjection of fppf sheaves.

Proof. The final assertion follows from the others, because an fppf morphism induces a surjection of associated represented fppf sheaves.

Due to the fibral criterion of flatness [EGA IV$_3$, 11.3.10] to handle (c), all the conditions can be checked fiberwise on S. We show that (a), (b), and (c) are equivalent for the fiber at $s \in S$.

Since $\mathcal{A}^0$, $\mathcal{B}^0$ are fppf over S, by [BLR90, §2.4 Proposition 4], $\dim \mathcal{A}_s^0 = \dim A$, $\dim \mathcal{B}_s^0 = \dim B$, and hence $\dim \mathcal{A}_s^0 = \dim \mathcal{B}_s^0$. Therefore, by [SGA 3$_\mathrm{I}$, Exposé VI$_\mathrm{B}$, Propositions 1.2 et 1.3], (a)⇔(b). Also, if ϕ_s is flat, then due to loc. cit., $\phi_s(\mathcal{A}_s^0)$ is both closed and open, hence equal to $\mathcal{B}_s^0$. Thus, (c)⇒(b). Also, $\ker \phi_s$ is flat, hence, if ϕ_s is surjective, it is also flat by [SGA 3$_\mathrm{I}$, Exposé VI$_\mathrm{A}$ Proposition 5.4.1 et Exposé VI$_\mathrm{B}$ Proposition 9.2 (ix)]. Thus, (b)⇒(c). ☐

3.8. Semiabelian reduction. For a closed point $s \in S$, recall that A is said to have *semiabelian reduction at* s, if $\mathcal{A}_s^0$ is an extension of an abelian variety by a torus, and that it is equivalent to require this over $k(s)^{\mathrm{alg}}$ [BLR90, §7.3 p. 178].

Lemma 3.9. *The following implies the equivalent conditions of Lemma 3.7:*

(d) A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points $s \in S$ *with* $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$.

If ϕ *is multiplication by* n*, then (d) is equivalent to the conditions of Lemma 3.7.*

Proof. For (d)⇒(b), it suffices to show surjectivity of ϕ_s for each $s \in S$. For this, inspect the dual isogeny of ϕ and use $\dim \mathcal{A}_s^0 = \dim \mathcal{B}_s^0$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.7) to reduce to the case of multiplication by $\deg \phi$. If $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$, then the claim results from multiplication by $\deg \phi$ being surjective on abelian varieties and tori. If $\operatorname{char} k(s) \nmid \deg \phi$, then multiplication by $\deg \phi$ induces an isomorphism on $\operatorname{Lie} \mathcal{A}_s^0$. Hence, $\dim \operatorname{Ker}(\deg \phi) = 0$, and so multiplication by $\deg \phi$ is surjective by [SGA 3_{I}, Exposé VI_{B}, Proposition 1.2].

If ϕ is multiplication by n, to see (a)⇒(d) reduce by 3.8 to $k(s)$ being algebraically closed. Then use the structure theory of algebraic groups to argue that if $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid n$, then $\mathcal{A}_s^0$ can have no $\mathbb{G}_a$ as a subgroup, hence must have a trivial unipotent radical. ☐

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose that A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points* $s \in S$ *with* $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$*. Then* $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ *is a commutative separated quasi-finite flat* S*-group scheme, which is a closed subgroup of* $\mathcal{A}$*. In particular,* $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ *is quasi-affine over* S*, and every fppf torsor under* $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ *is representable by a scheme.*

Proof. As observed in 3.1, $\mathcal{A}[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}$ is a closed immersion. Due to the fibral criterion of flatness [EGA IV_3, 11.3.10], it follows from Lemma 3.9 and [SGA 3_{I}, Exposé IV_{B}, Proposition 1.3] that $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is quasi-finite flat, hence so is $\mathcal{A}[\phi] \to S$. The last sentence results from Proposition A.7. ☐

Corollary 3.11. *Suppose that* $\operatorname{char} k(s) \nmid \deg \phi$ *for all closed points* s *of* S*. Then* $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ *is the Néron model of* $A[\phi]$*.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.10 and Proposition 2.6, $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ is the schematic image of $A[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}$ and is killed by $\deg \phi$. Then, by Corollary 3.10 and Proposition A.8, $\mathcal{A}[\phi] \to S$ is étale, so the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.8. ☐

Note that any choice of $\Gamma_s \subset \Phi_s$ gives rise to the $\phi_s(\Gamma_s)$. We denote by $\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)}$ the corresponding open S-subgroup scheme of $\mathcal{B}$, and observe that $\phi\colon \mathcal{A}^\Gamma \to \mathcal{B}$ factors through $\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 3.12. *Suppose that A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points s with* $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$*. Then for any choice of* $\Gamma_s \subset \Phi_s$*, the sequences*

(a) $0 \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)} \to 0,$

(b) $0 \to \mathcal{A}^0[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma[\phi] \to \bigoplus_s i_{s*}(\Gamma_s[\phi_s]) \to 0$

are exact in the fppf site of S*.*

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}^0[\phi] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathcal{A}^\Gamma[\phi] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}(\Gamma_s[\phi_s]) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{A}^0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads, "\phi"] & \mathcal{A}^\Gamma \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\phi"] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}\Gamma_s \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads, "\oplus_s i_{s*}\phi_s"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{B}^0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)} \arrow[r] & \bigoplus_s i_{s*}(\phi_s(\Gamma_s)) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the bottom horizontal sequences are short exact by Proposition 3.4, the left bottom surjection results from Lemma 3.9, and the right vertical sequence is short exact in the big étale site, and hence in the fppf site, because each i_{s*} is exact for the étale topology. Both claims now follow by invoking snake lemma. ☐

Corollary 3.13. *Suppose that A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points s with $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$, and that there is an isogeny $B \xrightarrow{\psi} C$ of abelian varieties, which then extends to a homomorphism $\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{C}$ of Néron models. Then for any choice of $\Gamma_s \subset \Phi_s$, the sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma[\psi \circ \phi] \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)}[\psi] \to 0$$

is exact in the fppf site of S.

Proof. By universality of quotients A.9(b), this follows from Proposition 3.12(a) by pulling back along $\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)}[\psi] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Gamma)}$. ☐

Remark 3.14. An example of a situation in which Proposition 3.12 and Corollary 3.13 apply is when $\phi = n$ and $\psi = m$ are multiplication by n and m isogenies, and A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points $s \in S$ with $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid n$.

4. Flat closed subgroups of Néron models

Assume the notation of 2.1, so, in particular, S is a connected Dedekind scheme with the function field K. Theorem 4.1 is the main result of this section; it yields an obstruction for a commutative fppf S-group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ to occur as a closed subgroup of a Néron lft model over S.

Theorem 4.1 (Theorem 1.11)**.** *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an fppf S-group algebraic space, and assume that there is a closed immersion of S-group algebraic spaces $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is commutative, and satisfies:*

(a) $\mathcal{X} \to S$ is locally of finite presentation;

(b) $\mathcal{X}(S) \to \mathcal{X}(K)$ is surjective;

(c) $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{X}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{X}_K)$ is injective.

(E.g., by 2.2 and Proposition 2.11, $\mathcal{X} \to S$ could be a commutative Néron lft model.) Then

$$H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K)$$

is injective.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{X}/\mathcal{G}$. By Lemma A.10(c), $\mathcal{Q}$ is a commutative separated S-group algebraic space. Once we show that $\mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{Q}(K)$ is injective, the conclusion follows from

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{X}(S) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads] & \mathcal{Q}(S) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S,\mathcal{G}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S,\mathcal{X}) \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathcal{X}(K) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{Q}(K) \arrow[r] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K,\mathcal{G}_K) \arrow[r] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K,\mathcal{X}_K)
\end{tikzcd}$$

by the four lemma.

Suppose $f \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$ vanishes in $\mathcal{Q}(K)$. Let $T \to S$ be fppf such that f is represented by a morphism $T \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{X}$. Since S is Noetherian, and fppf morphisms are open, we can assume that T is quasi-compact, hence Noetherian. Then, by covering S with open affines S_i, letting T_i be their preimages in T, to show that a factors through $\mathcal{G}$, and hence that $f = 0$, it suffices to show the same for every $a_i \colon T_i \hookrightarrow T \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{X}$. Replacing T_i with a disjoint union of open affines in a finite cover, we can assume that T_i is affine.

Let $s \in S_i$ be a closed point. By the valuative criterion of separatedness for algebraic spaces [LMB00, A.3], the restriction of f to $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ vanishes. Hence $T \times_S \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s} \to T \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{X}$, and also $T_i \times_{S_i} \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s} \to T_i \xrightarrow{a_i} \mathcal{X}$ factor through $\mathcal{G}$. Since T_i, S_i are affine, and both $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are locally of finite presentation, by spreading-out [SP, Definition 049J and Proposition 04AK] there is an open affine neighborhood $U \subset S_i$ of s, for which $T_i \times_{S_i} U \to T_i \xrightarrow{a_i} \mathcal{X}$ factors through $\mathcal{G}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is a sheaf, we conclude that a_i itself factors through $\mathcal{G}$, i.e., $f = 0$. ☐

Remark 4.2. The proof simplifies if $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are assumed to be schemes. Reducing to the case when T is Noetherian, one can then apply the spreading-out argument at every $s \in S$ to T directly using [EGA IV$_3$, 8.8.2 (i)]. The reason for introducing the auxiliary T_i above is to be able to apply the quoted result from [SP].

Remark 4.3. By [Mil80, III.4.9], $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathbb{G}_{m,S}) \cong \operatorname{Pic} S$, and by Hilbert's Theorem 90 (see also 1.14), $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathbb{G}_{m,K}) = 0$. Therefore, invoking Theorem 4.1, $\mathbb{G}_{m,S}$ cannot be a closed subgroup of a Néron lft model, if $\operatorname{Pic} S \neq 0$. For instance, this applies to $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$ where $\mathcal{O}_K$ is the ring of integers of a number field K with nontrivial class group. On the other hand, by [BLR90, §10.1 Example 5], $\mathbb{G}_{m,S}$ is always an open subgroup of the Néron lft model of $\mathbb{G}_{m,K}$. In particular, it is essential to assume in Theorem 4.1 that the immersion $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{X}$ be closed.

Theorem 4.1 gives an obstruction to $\mathcal{G}$ being a closed subgroup of a commutative Néron lft model. Unfortunately, it gives no restrictions, if $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is proper:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a commutative proper flat S-group algebraic space. Then*

$$H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K)$$

is injective.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an fppf torsor under $\mathcal{G}$. Since properness is fppf local [SP, Lemma 0422], $\mathcal{T} \to S$ is proper. By A.3, we need to show that $\mathcal{T}(S) \neq \varnothing$, whenever $\mathcal{T}(K) \neq \varnothing$. By spreading-out [SP, Definition 049J and Proposition 04AK], a $p \in \mathcal{T}(K)$ gives rise to a $P \in \mathcal{T}(U)$ for an affine open $U \subset S$. We augment U to S as follows: if $s \in S \backslash U$, then $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is a discrete valuation ring with fraction field K. By the valuative criterion of properness for algebraic spaces [LMB00, 7.5 et 7.5.2], p extends to $p_s \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s})$, which, by the spreading-out result quoted above, extends to a $Q \in \mathcal{T}(V)$ for an open affine neighborhood V of s. To glue P and Q using the sheaf axiom for $\mathcal{T}$, and then conclude by iteratively shrinking $S \backslash U$, we need to show that P and Q agree on $U \cap V$. But indeed, since they agree generically, by the uniqueness claim in the valuative criterion and the spreading-out argument, they agree on some affine open neighborhood $U_t \subset U \cap V$ for every $t \in U \cap V$. ☐

Proposition 4.4 applies in particular to commutative finite flat S-group schemes $\mathcal{G}$. What concerns such $\mathcal{G}$, it would be interesting to know the answer to (with the parenthesized conditions taken either present or absent)

Question 4.5. *Let $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$ be the spectrum of the ring of integers of a number field K. Is every commutative finite flat S-group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ a closed subgroup of a commutative Néron (lft) model (of an abelian variety)?*

Remark 4.6. Of course, one cannot hope that $\mathcal{G}$ would always be a closed subgroup of an abelian scheme over S (which is a Néron model of an abelian variety by Proposition 2.4). Indeed, by a theorem of Fontaine [Fon85, p. 517 Corollaire] and Abrashkin [Abr87, Theorem 5], if $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{Z}$, then the only abelian scheme over S is the trivial one. If, however, S is the spectrum of a Noetherian local ring, then an embedding of $\mathcal{G}$ into an abelian scheme over S exists by a theorem of Raynaud [BBM82, Théorème 3.1.1].

Proposition 4.8 shows that the answer to Question 4.5 is positive if for every rational prime $p \mid \#\mathcal{G}$ there is a unique place of K above p; e.g., this is the case for $K = \mathbb{Q}$. For the proof we will need:

Lemma 4.7. *Let S be a (connected) Dedekind scheme with the function field K, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be a commutative finite flat S-group scheme. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is a direct product of commutative finite flat S-group schemes of prime power order.*

Proof. If $l \neq \operatorname{char} K$ is a prime dividing $\#\mathcal{G}$, it suffices to split off a factor of order $l^n > 1$. Using the connected-étale sequence, build a short exact sequence $0 \to H \to \mathcal{G}_K \to Q \to 0$ of finite K-group schemes with $l \nmid \#H$ and $\#Q = l^n$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the schematic image of $H \to \mathcal{G}$. By Proposition 2.6, $\mathcal{H}$ is finite flat of order $\#\mathcal{H} = \#H$. By [Tat97, §3.5], $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ is a finite flat S-group scheme of order l^n and killed by l^n. Thus, by snake lemma for fppf sheaves, since l^n is an isomorphism on $\mathcal{H}$, its kernel on $\mathcal{G}$ is representable by $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. This gives a desired splitting $\mathcal{G} \cong \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. ☐

Proposition 4.8. *Let S be a (connected) Dedekind scheme with the function field K, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be a commutative finite flat S-group scheme. Suppose that for each prime $p \mid \#\mathcal{G}$ there is at most one closed point $s \in S$ with $\operatorname{char} k(s) = p$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is a closed subgroup of the Néron model $\mathcal{A}$ of an abelian variety $A = \mathcal{A}_K$.*

Proof. Since the Néron model of a product is the product of the Néron models, by Lemma 4.7, we are reduced to the case $\#\mathcal{G} = p^n$ for some rational prime $p \mid \#\mathcal{G}$.

If there is no $s \in S$ with $\operatorname{char} k(s) = p$, then, by Propositions 2.4 and A.8, $\mathcal{G}$ itself is a Néron model. By [BBM82, Théorème 3.1.1], there is a closed immersion of K-group schemes $\mathcal{G}_K \hookrightarrow A$ into an abelian variety. Let $\mathcal{A} \to S$ be the Néron model of A, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be the schematic image of $\mathcal{G}_K \to \mathcal{A}$. By Propositions 2.6 and A.8, $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is the Néron model of $\mathcal{G}_K$, hence $\mathcal{G} \cong \mathcal{H}$ giving the conclusion.

Assume now that the closed $s \in S$ is unique with $\operatorname{char} k(s) = p$. Then $S_{(p)} := \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is a local Dedekind scheme with function field K. By [BBM82, Théorème 3.1.1], there is a closed immersion of $S_{(p)}$-group schemes $\mathcal{G}_{S_{(p)}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{S_{(p)}}$ into an abelian scheme. By Proposition 2.4, $\mathcal{A}_{S_{(p)}} \to S_{(p)}$ is the Néron model of $A := (\mathcal{A}_{S_{(p)}})_K$, so we are done if $S_{(p)} = S$. Otherwise, let $\mathcal{A}$ be the Néron model of A over S. Proposition 2.3(b) justifies the notation, and $\mathcal{G}_{S_{(p)}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{S_{(p)}}$ spreads out [EGA IV$_3$, 8.8.2 (i) et 8.10.5 (iv)] to a closed immersion of U-group schemes $\mathcal{G}_U \to \mathcal{A}_U$ for some open $U \subset S$ containing s. By the argument of the case when p is invertible, $\mathcal{G}_{S-\{s\}}$ is étale and the unique $\mathcal{G}_{S-\{s\}} \to \mathcal{A}$

extending $\mathcal{G}_K \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_K$ is a closed immersion of $(S - \{s\})$-group schemes. Similar reasoning applies over $U \cap (S - \{s\})$, so we obtain a closed immersion of S-group schemes $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{A}$ by glueing. $\square$

Remark 4.9. As is clear from the proof, if $\#\mathcal{G} = p^n$ and $s \in S$ is the unique closed point with $\operatorname{char} k(s) = p$, then A can be taken to have good reduction at s.

Remark 4.10. Assume the notation of Question 4.5 and that $\#\mathcal{G} = p^n$. Let $S_{(p)}$ be the semilocal Dedekind scheme obtained from S by localizing away from p. Then the proof of Proposition 4.8 continues to answer Question 4.5 affirmatively, as long as over $S_{(p)}$ one can realize $\mathcal{G}_{S_{(p)}}$ as a closed subgroup of the Néron model of an abelian variety.

Example 4.11. Let K be a number field, let $\mathcal{O}_K$ be its ring of integers, and let p be a rational prime. The following example, due to Brian Conrad, shows that Theorem 4.1 can be used to exhibit commutative separated quasi-finite étale $\mathcal{O}_K$-group schemes $\mathcal{G}$ which are not closed subgroups of commutative Néron lft models over $\mathcal{O}_K$. Moreover, $\mathcal{G}$ can be taken to have fibers of p-power order. Consequently, the analogue of Question 4.5 for separated quasi-finite flat $\mathcal{G}$ has a negative answer.

Set $S := \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$, and fix $s \in S$ with $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid p$. Since $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ is Henselian, the functor $\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}_{k(s)}$ is an equivalence of categories between that of finite étale $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-schemes $\mathcal{Y}$ and that of finite étale $k(s)$-schemes [EGA IV$_4$, 18.5.15]. Moreover, since $k(s)$ is a field, the latter category is equivalent to that of finite discrete $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k(s)}/k(s))$-sets. Since $k(s)$ is finite, there is a unique cyclic degree p extension $l/k(s)$ contained in $\overline{k(s)}$. Choose a generator $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(l/k(s))$ and consider the 2-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_p$-representation V of $G := \operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k(s)}/k(s))$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\colon \operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k(s)}/k(s)) \twoheadrightarrow \operatorname{Gal}(l/k(s)) &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p), \\ \sigma &\mapsto \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the equivalences above, V gives a commutative finite étale $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-group scheme $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ of order p^2. The subspace $W \subset V$ spanned by $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ in the chosen basis is a trivial subrepresentation, which yields the open and closed $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-subgroup scheme $\mathcal{H} \cong (\underline{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}})_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ be the open $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-subgroup scheme obtained by removing the closed complement of $\mathcal{H}_{k(s)}$ from the special fiber of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ (this is analogous to the construction in 3.2). Note that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ is separated, quasi-finite, étale, and has fibers of p-power order.

Claim 4.11.1. $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ is not a closed $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-subgroup scheme of a commutative Néron lft model.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G}_{K^h_{S,s}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{K^h_{S,s}}$ be the generic fibers of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$, and let $\mathcal{G}_{k(s)}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{k(s)}$ be their special fibers. Set $\mathcal{Q} := \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}/\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$, which is an $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-group algebraic space by Lemma A.10(a), and note that $\mathcal{Q}_{k(s)} = \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{k(s)}/\mathcal{G}_{k(s)}$ by A.9(b). Also, because $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ is an étale surjection, and being an étale surjection is fppf local on the base [SP, Lemmas 042B and 041Q], by Lemma A.10(b), $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \to \mathcal{Q}$ is an étale cover by a scheme. Thus, since $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ is étale, so is $\mathcal{Q} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$.

By Theorem 4.1, we only need to show that $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K^h_{S,s}})$ has a nontrivial kernel. Since $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ is an isomorphism on generic fibers, it suffices to show that $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}, \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}})$ has a nontrivial kernel, or that $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}) \to \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s})$ is not surjective. For that, since $W = V^G \to (V/W)^G$ is not surjective, and hence neither is $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{k(s)}(k(s)) \to \mathcal{Q}_{k(s)}(k(s))$, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}) \to \mathcal{Q}(k(s))$ is surjective, as we do below.

Let $x \in \mathcal{Q}(k(s))$. By [LMB00, 6.3], there exists a scheme U and a smooth $U \to \mathcal{Q}$ such that x lifts to a $y \in U(k(s))$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{Q} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ is étale, $U \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ is smooth; also, $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ is Henselian, so y lifts to $y' \in U(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h)$ [BLR90, §2.3 Proposition 5]. Consequently, y' gives $x' \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h)$, which is a desired lift of x. ☐

Remark 4.11.2. Let R be a Henselian discrete valuation ring with the residue field k. Given finite discrete $G := \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k}/k)$-modules $W \subset V$ with $V^G \to (V/W)^G$ not surjective, the same argument as above produces a separated quasi-finite étale R-group scheme that is not a closed R-subgroup scheme of a commutative Néron lft model.

As is suggested by the notation, we now argue the existence of a $\mathcal{G} \to S$ which has the desired properties and whose base change to $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ is $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$. Then it follows from Proposition 2.3 that $\mathcal{G}$ is not a closed S-subgroup scheme of a commutative Néron lft model. We start by descending to $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$:

Claim 4.11.3. The open immersion of commutative $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$-group schemes $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$ descends to an open immersion of commutative $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-group schemes $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$. Moreover, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is finite, étale, and of order p^2.

Proof. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$ is affine, by [BLR90, §6.2 Proposition D.4 (b)], to descend it to $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$, it suffices to descend its generic fiber $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{K_{S,s}^h}$ to an affine $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_K$ (by the full faithfulness in loc. cit., various diagrams defining the structure of a commutative group scheme will descend, too). For that, since by construction $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{K_{S,s}^h}$ corresponds to a $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K_{S,s}^h}/K_{S,s}^h)$-representation that factors through $\mathrm{Gal}(L'/K_{S,s}^h)$, where $L'/K_{S,s}^h$ is the degree p unramified extension inside $\overline{K_{S,s}^h}$, it suffices to find a cyclic degree p extension L/K inside $\overline{K}$ which is inert at s. This is possible by the Grunwald-Wang theorem [NSW08, 9.2.8].

Since $\mathcal{O}_{S,s} \to \mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ induces an isomorphism on residue fields (cf. 2.1), the special fibers of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$ are isomorphic. Therefore, to descend $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$ to an open $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-subgroup scheme $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$, one removes the closed subscheme of the special fiber of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ corresponding to the closed subscheme that was removed to obtain $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$ from $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$.

By A.11, the last sentence results from fpqc descent [EGA IV$_2$, 2.7.1 (xv)], [EGA IV$_4$, 17.7.3 (ii)]. ☐

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_K$ be the generic fiber of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$, and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \to S$ be its Néron model. By Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, the base change of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$, justifying the notation. Hence, the fibers of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ at s are isomorphic, and one forms an open subgroup scheme $\mathcal{G} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ by removing the closed subscheme of the fiber at s corresponding to the one removed from $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ to obtain $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$. The base change of $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h$ is $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}^h}$, so, as observed before Claim 4.11.3, the conclusion results from

Claim 4.11.4. The commutative S-group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ is separated, quasi-finite, étale, and has fibers of p-power order.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is an open S-subgroup scheme of the Néron model $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \to S$, the claimed properties will follow from the corresponding ones for $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$, which are consequences of Proposition 2.9. ☐

5. SELMER-TYPE DESCRIPTIONS OF SETS OF TORSORS

The main result of this technical section is Theorem 5.3, which will enable us in 7.2 to interpret certain fppf cohomology groups as Selmer groups for a Selmer structure; see Remark 5.5 and Example 5.7 for its main cases of applicability. The notation is that of 2.1; in particular, S is a connected Dedekind scheme with the function field K. For the purpose of stating the results more clearly, we set $K_{S,s} := \mathrm{Frac}\, \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ for each closed point $s \in S$. This is merely a notational convention, because, if one ignores the valuation that s gives rise to, $K_{S,s} = K$. Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 involve only local S, but we state them using the notation with which they will be applied.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $s \in S$, and let F be the functor*

$$X \mapsto (X_{K_{S,s}}, X_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}, \tau \colon (X_{K_{S,s}})_{K^h_{S,s}} \xrightarrow{\sim} (X_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}})_{K^h_{S,s}})$$

from the category of $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebraic spaces to the category of triples consisting of a $K_{S,s}$-algebraic space, an $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$-algebraic space, and an isomorphism between their base changes to $K^h_{S,s}$.

(a) *When restricted to the full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-schemes, F is an equivalence onto the full subcategory of triples of schemes that admit a quasi-affine open covering. The same conclusion holds with $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$ replaced by $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$.*

(b) *When restricted to the full subcategory of quasi-separated $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebraic spaces of finite presentation, F is an equivalence onto the full subcategory of triples involving only quasi-separated algebraic spaces of finite presentation. If $\widehat{K}_{S,s}/K_{S,s}$ is separable*[3] *(equivalently, if $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is excellent), the same conclusion holds with $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$ replaced by $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$.*

Proof. The claim is true if s is the generic point; thus, assume that $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is a discrete valuation ring.

(a) This is proved in [BLR90, §6.2 Proposition D.4 (b)]. A triple of schemes admits a quasi-affine open covering if $X_{K_{S,s}} = \bigcup_{i \in I} U_i$ and $X_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}} = \bigcup_{i \in I} V_i$ for quasi-affine open subschemes U_i, V_i for which τ restricts to isomorphisms $(U_i)_{K^h_{S,s}} \xrightarrow{\sim} (V_i)_{K^h_{S,s}}$.

(b) The proof is due to Brian Conrad. We first treat the case of $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$. By construction, $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ is a filtered direct limit of local étale $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebras R which are discrete valuation rings sharing the residue field and a uniformizer with $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$. Given a $T = (Y, \mathcal{Y}, \tau \colon Y_{K^h_{S,s}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{Y}_{K^h_{S,s}})$ with $Y \to \mathrm{Spec}\, K_{S,s}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \to \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ quasi-separated and of finite presentation, to show that it is in the essential image of the restricted F we first descend $\mathcal{Y}$ to $\mathcal{Y}' \to \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ for some R as above using limit considerations of [Ols06, proof of Proposition 2.2]. Similarly, since $K^h_{S,s} = \varinjlim \mathrm{Frac}(R)$, by loc. cit., τ also descends to $\tau' \colon Y_{\mathrm{Frac}(R)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathrm{Frac}(R)}$ after possibly increasing R. Transporting along τ' the descent datum on $Y_{\mathrm{Frac}(R)}$ with respect to $\mathrm{Frac}(R)/K_{S,s}$, one gets a descent datum on $\mathcal{Y}'_{\mathrm{Frac}(R)}$, which, as explained in [BLR90, §6.2 proof of Lemma C.2], extends uniquely to a descent datum on $\mathcal{Y}'$ with respect to $R/\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$. By [LMB00, 1.6.4], the descent datum is effective giving us a quasi-separated $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebraic space X; by construction, $F(X) \cong T$, and by [SP, Lemma 041V], X is also of finite presentation. The full faithfulness of F follows from an analogous limit argument using étale descent for morphisms of sheaves on $(\mathcal{O}_{S,s})_{\text{Ét}}$ and [LMB00, 4.18 (i)].

---

[3] A not necessarily algebraic field extension l/k is *separable*, if, setting $p = \mathrm{char}\, k$, either $p = 0$ or l/k is linearly disjoint from $k^{1/p}/k$, where $k^{1/p} = \{x \in k^{\mathrm{alg}} \mid x^p \in k\}$.

The argument for $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$ is similar. By Néron-Popescu desingularization [Swa98, Theorem 1.1], $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ is a filtered direct limit of smooth $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebras L; then one also has $\widehat{K}_{S,s} = \varinjlim L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} K_{S,s}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}_L \subset L$ be the preimage of the maximal ideal of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$; then $\mathfrak{m}_L$ is a maximal ideal sharing the residue field with $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$. By [BLR90, §2.2 Proposition 14], for any such L there is a local étale $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebra $(R_L, \mathfrak{r}_L)$ which is a discrete valuation ring admitting an $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-homomorphism $L \xrightarrow{f_L} R_L$, $f_L^{-1}(\mathfrak{r}_L) = \mathfrak{m}_L$ that induces an isomorphism on the residue fields. For the essential surjectivity of the restricted F, we first descend to some L as before, then pullback to R_L, at which point the argument of the previous case applies. Similarly, the only difference in the proof of full faithfulness is the pulling back to R_L step. ☐

Lemma 5.2. *Let $s \in S$, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be a flat, of finite presentation, and quasi-separated $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-group algebraic space. If the horizontal arrows in*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K_{S,s}}) \arrow[d] \\
H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}) \arrow[r, hook] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K^h_{S,s}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

(cf. A.3) are injective, then the square is Cartesian. The same conclusion holds under analogous assumptions with $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$ replaced by $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$, if either $\mathcal{G}$ is a quasi-affine $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-group scheme or $\widehat{K}_{S,s}/K_{S,s}$ is separable (the latter is equivalent to $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ being excellent).

Proof. We first treat the case of $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$. By A.3, we need to show that every $\mathcal{G}_{K_{S,s}}$-torsor $\mathcal{T}_{K_{S,s}}$ which, when base changed to $K^h_{S,s}$, extends to a $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$-torsor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$, already extends to a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor $\mathcal{T} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$. By Lemma 5.1 and [SP, Lemmas 041N, 041V], $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}$ descends to an $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebraic space $\mathcal{T}$, which is fppf by A.11 and [SP, Lemmas 041Q, 041W, 041T]. By the full faithfulness in Lemma 5.1, various diagrams defining the $\mathcal{G}$-action descend, too. Since $\mathcal{T}$ has a section after the base change by the fppf $\mathcal{T} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$, to check that it is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor it suffices to argue that

$$\mathcal{G} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T} \times_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}} \mathcal{T}, \quad (g, t) \mapsto (gt, t) \tag{6}$$

is an isomorphism. That this is the case can be seen after the base change by the fpqc (cf. A.11) $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ [SP, Lemma 041Y].

In the analogous proof for $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$ one appeals to Proposition A.6 to apply Lemma 5.1. ☐

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is a flat, of finite presentation, and quasi-separated S-group algebraic space. If the horizontal arrows in (the products are indexed by the closed points of S)*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G}) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K) \arrow[d] \\
\prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}) \arrow[r, hook] & \prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K_{S,s}}),
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7}$$

(cf. A.3) are injective, and if in addition

$$H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(V, \mathcal{G}_V) \to H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, \mathcal{G}_K) \tag{8}$$

from A.3 is injective for every nonempty open $V \subset S$, then (7) is Cartesian. The same conclusion holds with $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ and $K_{S,s}$ replaced by $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$ (resp., $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$), if one assumes in addition *that the bottom horizontal arrow in* (7) *stays injective when $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ and $K_{S,s}$ are replaced by $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ and $K^h_{S,s}$ (resp., $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$) and, in the case of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$, that for each closed $s \in S$ either*

(i) $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ is a quasi-affine $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-group scheme or

(ii) $\widehat{K}_{S,s}/K_{S,s}$ is a separable extension (equivalently, $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ is excellent).

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, assuming injectivity of the bottom horizontal arrow, the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & \prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K_{S,s}}) \arrow[d] \\
\prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}}) \arrow[r, hook] & \prod_s H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K^h_{S,s}, \mathcal{G}_{K^h_{S,s}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

is Cartesian, and likewise for $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$ and $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$. It remains to argue that (7) is Cartesian.

By A.3, we need to show that every $\mathcal{G}_K$-torsor $\mathcal{T}_K$ which extends to a $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$-torsor $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ for every closed point $s \in S$, already extends to a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor $\mathcal{T}$. Since $\mathcal{T}_K$ inherits quasi-separatedness and finite presentation from $\mathcal{G}_K$, by [Ols06, Proposition 2.2 and its proof] and [LMB00, 4.18 (i)], for some open dense $U \subset S$ we spread out $\mathcal{T}_K \to \operatorname{Spec} K$ to a $\mathcal{T}_U \to U$ which is faithfully flat, of finite presentation, has a $\mathcal{G}_U$-action, and for which the analogue of (6) over U is bijective. Consequently, $\mathcal{T}_U \to U$ is a $\mathcal{G}_U$-torsor.

It suffices to show that we can increase U by extending $\mathcal{T}_U$ over some $s \in S - U$; iterating this, we will extend $\mathcal{T}_K$ to a desired $\mathcal{G}$-torsor $\mathcal{T} \to S$. Analogously to how it is done above, spread out $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ to a $\mathcal{G}_W$-torsor $\mathcal{T}_W$ over some open neighborhood $W \subset S$ of s. Since (8) is injective with $V = U \cap W$, the torsors $\mathcal{T}_U$ and $\mathcal{T}_W$ are isomorphic when base changed to $U \cap W$. Glueing them we extend $\mathcal{T}_U$ to a desired $\mathcal{T}_{U \cup \{s\}}$. ☐

Remark 5.4. The assumption (ii) holds in the main cases of interest, namely, when S is (a nonempty open subscheme of) a smooth proper curve over a finite field or the spectrum of the ring of integers in a number field (see, for instance, [Liu02, 8.2.40]).

Remark 5.5. We will apply Theorem 5.3 with $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A}[\phi]$ assuming the setup of 3.1 and also that A has semiabelian reduction at all closed points $s \in S$ with $\operatorname{char} k(s) \mid \deg \phi$. With this $\mathcal{G}$, the assumptions of Theorem 5.3 are satisfied due to Proposition 2.3, Corollary 3.10, and Theorem 4.1.

Remark 5.6. Due to Proposition 4.4, another possible choice for $\mathcal{G}$ is any commutative finite flat S-group scheme. Due to Propositions 2.3 and 2.11, at least if (ii) holds, one could also take $\mathcal{G}$ to be a commutative Néron model, as we do in Example 5.7. Note, however, that part (b) of Lemma 5.1 is needed for this choice of $\mathcal{G}$.

Example 5.7. Suppose that S is a smooth proper curve over a finite field or the spectrum of the ring of integers of a number field. Let A be an abelian variety over K, let $\mathcal{A} \to S$ be its Néron model, let v denote a place of K, let K_v be the corresponding local field, let $\mathcal{O}_v$ be its ring of integers, and, if $v \nmid \infty$, let c_v be the corresponding local Tamagawa factor of A (cf. 6.6). By Remarks 5.4 and 5.6 and Theorem 5.3, the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & H^1(K, A) \arrow[d] \\
\prod_{v \nmid \infty} H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \arrow[r, hook] & \prod_{v \nmid \infty} H^1(K_v, A)
\end{tikzcd}$$

is Cartesian, and we conclude that $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}) \subset H^1(K, A)$ contains the Shafarevich-Tate group $Ш(A/K) = \mathrm{Ker}(H^1(K, A) \to \prod_v H^1(K_v, A))$. We can also bound the index: as will be proved in Lemma 6.7, $\#H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}_v}) = c_v$, so

$$[H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}) : Ш(A/K)] \leqslant \prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_v \prod_{v \text{ real}} \#H^1(K_v, A) \leqslant \prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_v \prod_{v \text{ real}} 2^{\dim A},$$

where the last inequality follows from [Mil06, I.3.7]. In particular, the conjectural finiteness of $Ш(A/K)$ is equivalent to that of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A})$. This relation is not new: similar observations are made in [Maz72, Appendix] and [McC86, Lemma 5.9] by computations involving various cohomology sequences.

6. Images of local Kummer homomorphisms as flat cohomology groups

6.1. The image of the Kummer map. Assume that k is an arbitrary field, and $\phi\colon A \to B$ is an isogeny of abelian varieties over k. With $S = \mathrm{Spec}\, k$ in Proposition 3.12(a), we find an exact sequence

$$0 \to A[\phi] \to A \xrightarrow{\phi} B \to 0 \tag{9}$$

of represented sheaves on $(\mathrm{Spec}\, k)_{\mathrm{fppf}}$. Its long exact cohomology sequence gives the *Kummer map* $B(k) \xrightarrow{\kappa_\phi} H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$, and we consider its image $B(k)/\phi A(k) \cong \mathrm{Im}\, \kappa_\phi \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$.

If $\mathrm{char}\, k \nmid \deg \phi$, then, by inspecting the dual isogeny, we find that ϕ induces an isomorphism on Lie algebras, and hence is étale [BLR90, §2.2 Corollary 10], [SGA 3_{I}, Exposé $\mathrm{IV_B}$, Proposition 1.3]. In this case, ϕ is an étale surjection, (9) is exact in $(\mathrm{Spec}\, k)_{\mathrm{Ét}}$, and $A[\phi]$ is a finite étale k-group scheme. The identifications of 1.14 give

$$H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi]) \cong H^1_{\mathrm{ét}}(k, A[\phi]) \cong H^1(k, A[\phi]), \tag{10}$$

which restrict to identifications of the images of Kummer maps.

6.2. The setup. For the rest of this section, let $S = \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathfrak{o}$ for a Henselian discrete valuation ring $\mathfrak{o}$, let $k = \mathrm{Frac}\, \mathfrak{o}$, let $\mathbb{F}$ be the residue field of $\mathfrak{o}$, let s be the closed point of S, let $i\colon \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{F} \to \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathfrak{o}$ be the corresponding closed immersion, let $\phi\colon A \to B$ be an isogeny of abelian varieties over k, let $A[\phi]$ be its kernel, let $\phi\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be the corresponding homomorphism of their Néron models over S, let $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ be its kernel (note that $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_k = A[\phi]$), and let, by abuse of notation, $\phi\colon \mathcal{A}_s \to \mathcal{B}_s$ be the homomorphism induced on the special fibers. For example, by Proposition 2.3, this situation could arise from that of 3.1 after the base change to $\mathcal{O}^h_{S,s}$ or $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$, where $s \in S$ is a closed point. We also denote by Φ_A and Φ_B the étale $\mathbb{F}$-group schemes of connected components of $\mathcal{A}_s$ and $\mathcal{B}_s$ and use various open subgroups of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ constructed in 3.2.

6.3. The three subgroups of interest. The first one is $\mathrm{Im}\, \kappa_\phi \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$ from 6.1.

To exhibit the second one, we assume that A has semiabelian reduction if $\mathrm{char}\, \mathbb{F} \mid \deg \phi$. Then the second subgroup is the image of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \xrightarrow{a} H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$. By Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 4.1, a is injective, which lets us identify $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) = \mathrm{Im}\, a \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$.

To define the third subgroup we assume that $\mathrm{char}\, k \nmid \deg \phi$, use $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, A[\phi]) \cong H^1(k, A[\phi])$ from 6.1, and take the unramified cohomology subgroup $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k, A[\phi]) \subset H^1(k, A[\phi])$. Recall:

$$H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k, A[\phi]) := \mathrm{Ker}(H^1(k, A[\phi]) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}} H^1(k^{sh}, A[\phi])), \tag{11}$$

where $k^{sh} := \operatorname{Frac} \mathfrak{o}^{sh}$. If $\mathfrak{o}$ is the ring of integers of a nonarchimedean local field k, then k^{sh} is its maximal unramified extension, and (11) recovers the usual unramified cohomology subgroup.

The first subgroup appears in the definition of the ϕ-Selmer group, whereas the second (resp., third) only depends on the $\mathfrak{o}$-group scheme $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ (resp., $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{k}/k)$-representation $A[\phi](\overline{k})$), hence should be more amenable to study. We investigate $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi$ by exploring its relations with the other two subgroups in Propositions 6.8 and 6.10.

Before proceeding to Proposition 6.8, we record several lemmas that will be used in the proofs.

Lemma 6.4 (Lang). *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field, and let G be an algebraic group over $\mathbb{F}$ (i.e., a finite type smooth $\mathbb{F}$-group scheme) which is connected and commutative. Then $H^i(\mathbb{F}, G) = 0$ for $i \geqslant 1$.*

Proof. For $i = 1$ the claim is true even without the commutativity assumption [Lan56, Theorem 2]. Also, since $H^i(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{G}_a) = 0$ for $i \geqslant 1$ [Ser79, X.§1 Proposition 1], in addition to $i \geqslant 2$ we assume that G has a trivial unipotent radical, and hence is a semiabelian variety. In this case, multiplication by every $n \geqslant 1$ on G is surjective and quasi-finite, so the conclusion follows from $H^i(\mathbb{F}, G)$ being torsion and $\mathbb{F}$ having cohomological dimension 1. ☐

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field with $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}/\mathbb{F}) \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$, and let M be a finite discrete $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}/\mathbb{F})$-module. Then $\# H^0(\mathbb{F}, M) = \# H^1(\mathbb{F}, M)$.*

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}/\mathbb{F}) \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$, this is a consequence of the Herbrand quotient of a finite module being 1 [Ser79, VIII.§4 Proposition 8], and the maps in $H^1(\mathbb{F}, M) = \varinjlim_{[\mathbb{F}_n:\mathbb{F}]=n} H^1(\mathbb{F}_n/\mathbb{F}, M^{\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}/\mathbb{F}_n)})$ being injections coming from inflation-restriction sequences. ☐

6.6. The local Tamagawa factors. That of A is $c_A := \#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})$, i.e., it is the number of rational components of the special fiber of the Néron model $\mathcal{A}$. Similarly, the local Tamagawa factor of B is $c_B := \#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})$. Of course, if A and B have good reduction, then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are abelian schemes, so $c_A = c_B = 1$. Note that ϕ gives exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \Phi_A[\phi](\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to & \Phi_A(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to (\phi(\Phi_A))(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to 0, \\ 0 \to (\phi(\Phi_A))(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to & \Phi_B(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to (\Phi_B/\phi(\Phi_A))(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

of $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}/\mathbb{F})$-modules, from which

$$\frac{\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})} \leqslant \#\Phi_A[\phi](\mathbb{F}), \qquad \frac{\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})} \leqslant \# \left(\frac{\Phi_B}{\phi(\Phi_A)} \right)(\mathbb{F}). \tag{13}$$

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\Gamma \subset \Phi_A$ be a subgroup scheme and suppose that $\mathbb{F}$ is finite. There is a natural isomorphism $H^1_{\text{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}^\Gamma) \cong H^1(\mathbb{F}, \Gamma)$; moreover, $H^i_{\text{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}^\Gamma) = 0$ for $i \geqslant 2$. In particular, $\# H^1_{\text{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}^\Gamma) = \#\Gamma(\mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. This follows from the long exact cohomology sequence of $0 \to \mathcal{A}^0_{\mathbb{F}} \to \mathcal{A}^\Gamma_{\mathbb{F}} \to \Gamma \to 0$, Proposition A.2(b), and Lemma 6.4 (see also 1.14 regarding various cohomology identifications). ☐

We now compare the subgroups $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi, H^1_{\text{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset H^1_{\text{fppf}}(k, A[\phi])$ defined in 6.3:

Proposition 6.8. *Suppose that $\mathbb{F}$ is finite and that A has semiabelian reduction if* $\operatorname{char} \mathbb{F} \mid \deg \phi$.

(a) *Then*

$$\#\left(\frac{\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\right)=\frac{\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})}\overset{(13)}{\leqslant}\#\left(\frac{\Phi_B}{\phi(\Phi_A)}\right)(\mathbb{F}),$$
$$\#\left(\frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\right)=\frac{\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})}\overset{(13)}{\leqslant}\#\Phi_A[\phi](\mathbb{F}).$$

In particular, $\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})\mid\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})$ *and* $\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})\mid\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})$ *(the latter is also clear from* (12)*).*

(b) *There is an injection (this gives some information about the group structure of the source)*

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\hookrightarrow\left(\frac{\Phi_B}{\phi(\Phi_A)}\right)(\mathbb{F}).$$

(c) *If* $\deg\phi$ *is prime to* c_B*, then* $\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})=(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$*, and hence, by (a),* $\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi\subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])$.

(d) *If* $\deg\phi$ *is prime to* c_A*, then* $\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})=(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$*, and hence, by (a),* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\subset\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi$.

(e) *If* $\deg\phi$ *is prime to* c_Ac_B*, then* $\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi=H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])$.

Proof.

(a) Only the equalities require proofs.

The short exact sequence $0\to\mathcal{A}[\phi]\to\mathcal{A}\xrightarrow{\phi}\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}\to 0$ of Proposition 3.12(a), together with A.9(b), give the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}(\mathfrak{o})/\phi\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{o}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi]) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & \operatorname{Ker}(H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A})\xrightarrow{f}H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)})) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, hook] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & B(k)/\phi A(k) \arrow[r, "\kappa_\phi"] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k,A[\phi]) \arrow[r] & H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k,A)[\phi] \arrow[r] & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the injectivity of the vertical arrows follows from Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 4.1. By Lemma 6.7, f identifies with $H^1(\mathbb{F},\Phi_A)\xrightarrow{h}H^1(\mathbb{F},\phi(\Phi_A))$ induced by ϕ; moreover, h is onto. Since $\frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\cong\operatorname{Ker}f\cong\operatorname{Ker}h$, we get

$$\#\left(\frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\right)=\#\operatorname{Ker}h=\frac{\#H^1(\mathbb{F},\Phi_A)}{\#H^1(\mathbb{F},\phi(\Phi_A))}\overset{6.5}{=}\frac{\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})},$$

giving one of the desired equalities. On the other hand,

$$\frac{\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\cong\frac{B(k)/\phi A(k)}{\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}(\mathfrak{o})/\phi\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{o})}\cong\frac{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{o})/\phi\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{o})}{\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}(\mathfrak{o})/\phi\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{o})}\cong\frac{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{o})}{\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}(\mathfrak{o})}.\tag{14}$$

The long exact étale cohomology sequence of $0\to\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}\to\mathcal{B}\to i_*(\Phi_B/\phi(\Phi_A))\to 0$ from Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 6.7 give the exact sequence

$$0\to\frac{\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{o})}{\mathcal{B}^{\phi(\Phi_A)}(\mathfrak{o})}\to\left(\frac{\Phi_B}{\phi(\Phi_A)}\right)(\mathbb{F})\to H^1(\mathbb{F},\phi(\Phi_A))\to H^1(\mathbb{F},\Phi_B)\twoheadrightarrow H^1\left(\mathbb{F},\frac{\Phi_B}{\phi(\Phi_A)}\right),\tag{15}$$

where we have used the exactness of i_* for the étale topology to obtain the last term. Combining (14) and (15) yields the remaining desired

$$\#\left(\frac{\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\cap\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi}\right)=\frac{\#(\Phi_B/\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})\cdot\#H^1(\mathbb{F},\Phi_B)}{\#H^1(\mathbb{F},\phi(\Phi_A))\cdot\#H^1(\mathbb{F},\Phi_B/\phi(\Phi_A))}\overset{6.5}{=}\frac{\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})}{\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})}.$$

(b) This follows from (14) and (15).

(c) By inspecting the dual isogeny, $(\deg\phi)(\Phi_B)\subset\phi(\Phi_A)$, so if $\deg\phi$ is prime to $\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})$, then

$$\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})=(\deg\phi)(\Phi_B(\mathbb{F}))\subset((\deg\phi)(\Phi_B))(\mathbb{F})\subset\phi(\Phi_A)(\mathbb{F})\subset\Phi_B(\mathbb{F}),$$

and hence $\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})=(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$.

(d) By inspecting the dual isogeny, $\Phi_A[\phi]\subset\Phi_A[\deg\phi]$, so if $\deg\phi$ is prime to $\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})$, then $\Phi_A[\phi](\mathbb{F})=0$. In this case, $\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})=\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$ by (a), and therefore the injection $\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})\hookrightarrow(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$ from (12) is an isomorphism.

(e) Combine (c) and (d). ☐

Remark 6.9. In the case when $\dim A=1$, and ϕ is multiplication by a prime power, Proposition 6.8(e) has already been observed in [MR12, Proposition 5.8].

We now compare the third subgroup $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])\subset H^1(k,A[\phi])$ of 6.3 to $\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi$ and $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])$:

Proposition 6.10. *Suppose that* $\operatorname{char}k\nmid\deg\phi$.

(a) The Néron model $\mathcal{G}\to\operatorname{Spec}\mathfrak{o}$ of $A[\phi]\to\operatorname{Spec}k$ exists and is étale.

(b) The map $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{G})\to H^1(k,A[\phi])$ (cf. (10)) is an isomorphism onto $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])$.

(c) The image of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])\to H^1(k,A[\phi])$ (cf. (10)) contains $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])$.

(d) One has $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])\subset\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi$, if one assumes in addition that

(i) $\mathbb{F}$ is finite,

(ii) A has semiabelian reduction if $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}\mid\deg\phi$, and

(iii) $\deg\phi$ is prime to c_A or, more generally (cf. Proposition 6.8(d)), $\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})=\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})$.

(e) If $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}\nmid\deg\phi$, then $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])=H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])$.

(f) One has $\operatorname{Im}\kappa_\phi=H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o},\mathcal{A}[\phi])=H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k,A[\phi])$, if one assumes in addition that

(i) $\mathbb{F}$ is finite,

(ii) $\operatorname{char}\mathbb{F}\nmid\deg\phi$, and

(iii) $\deg\phi$ is prime to c_Ac_B or, more generally (cf. Proposition 6.8(c) and (d)), $\#\Phi_A(\mathbb{F})=\#(\phi(\Phi_A))(\mathbb{F})=\#\Phi_B(\mathbb{F})$.

Proof.

(a) By 6.1, if $\operatorname{char}k\nmid\deg\phi$, then $A[\phi]$ is étale, hence the conclusion by Proposition 2.9.

(b) This is a special case of Proposition 2.12 (see also Remark 2.13).

(c) Due to (b), it suffices to argue that there is an $\mathfrak{o}$-morphism $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{A}[\phi]$ inducing an isomorphism on generic fibers. By 3.1, $\mathcal{A}[\phi]$ is a closed subgroup of $\mathcal{A}$, so it contains the schematic image $\mathcal{H}$ of $A[\phi] \to \mathcal{A}$, and, by Proposition 2.6, $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{A}[\phi]_k$. We conclude by Theorem 2.8, because by 2.7, the group smoothening $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ is an isomorphism on generic fibers.

(d) By Proposition 6.8(a), $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset \operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi$, so the conclusion results from (c).

(e) This follows from (b), because if $\operatorname{char} \mathbb{F} \nmid \deg \phi$, then $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A}[\phi]$ by Corollary 3.11.

(f) By Proposition 6.8(a), $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$, so the conclusion results from (e). ☐

Remark 6.11. A well-known lemma of Cassels [Cas65, Lemma 4.1] gives $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi = H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(k, A[\phi])$, if k is a local field, $\operatorname{char} \mathbb{F} \nmid \deg \phi$, and A has good reduction. Proposition 6.10(f) generalizes this result by allowing more general k and arbitrary reduction types, as long as the requirement $\operatorname{char} \mathbb{F} \nmid \deg \phi$ is maintained and one assumes that c_A and c_B are prime to $\deg \phi$ (in the case of good reduction, $c_A = c_B = 1$). In the case of elliptic curves, i.e., $\dim A = 1$, the generalization allowing arbitrary reduction types has also been observed in [SS04, Lemma 4.5].

7. Selmer groups as flat cohomology groups

Assume the setup of 3.1, taking K to be a global field. If K is a number field, take $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K$, where $\mathcal{O}_K$ is the ring of integers of K; if K is a function field, take S to be the smooth proper curve with function field K. Recall that $A \xrightarrow{\phi} B$ is an isogeny between abelian varieties over K, and $\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}$ is the induced homomorphism of their Néron models over S. Denote by v a place of K, and by K_v the corresponding local field. If $v \nmid \infty$, then $\mathcal{O}_v$ is the ring of integers of K_v, and $\mathbb{F}_v$ is its residue field; v corresponds to a closed point $s \in S$, and, in the notation of 2.1, K_v, $\mathcal{O}_v$, and $\mathbb{F}_v$ are $\widehat{K}_{S,s}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s}$, and $k(s)$. Set $\mathcal{A}_v := \mathcal{A}_s$ and $\mathcal{B}_v := \mathcal{B}_s$, and let $\Phi_{A,v}$ and $\Phi_{B,v}$ be their $\mathbb{F}_v$-group schemes of connected components. Let $c_{A,v} := \#\Phi_{A,v}(\mathbb{F}_v)$ and $c_{B,v} := \#\Phi_{B,v}(\mathbb{F}_v)$ be the local Tamagawa factors. These are 1 at all places where A and B have good reduction (see 6.6). Set $\phi_v := \phi_s$, and, by abuse of notation, denote the induced homomorphism $\Phi_{A,v} \to \Phi_{B,v}$ by ϕ_v as well.

7.1. Selmer structures. Let M be a finite discrete $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$-module. A *Selmer structure* on M is a choice of a subgroup of $H^1(K_v, M)$ for each place v such that for all but finitely many v the unramified cohomology subgroup $H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(K_v, M) \subset H^1(K_v, M)$ is chosen. The *Selmer group* of a Selmer structure is the subgroup of $H^1(K, M)$ consisting of those cohomology classes whose restrictions to every $H^1(K_v, M)$ lie in the chosen subgroups. This definition differs from [MR07, Definition 1.2] only in that we do not require M to be an $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector space for some rational prime p.

7.2. The two Selmer structures on the kernel of ϕ. Assume that $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$. By 6.1, $A[\phi] \to \operatorname{Spec} K$ is finite étale, so we identify it with the associated $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$-representation $A[\phi](\overline{K})$.

The first Selmer structure on $A[\phi]$ is obtained by taking the images of the local Kummer homomorphisms $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v} \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$ (cf. 6.1) for the defining subgroups. The corresponding Selmer group is by definition the *ϕ-Selmer group*[4] $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/K) \subset H^1(K, A[\phi])$.

---

[4] In general, without the assumption $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$, the ϕ-Selmer group is defined as the subgroup of those elements of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, A[\phi])$ whose restrictions to every $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_v, A[\phi])$ lie in $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v}$ (the latter is $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_\phi$ of 6.1 with $\mathfrak{o} = \mathcal{O}_v$).

The second Selmer structure on $A[\phi]$ is defined, only if one assumes in addition that A has semiabelian reduction at all places $v \mid \deg \phi$ (there is no assumption, other than[5] $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$, if $\operatorname{char} K > 0$). In this case, using Proposition 2.3, 6.3, and Proposition 6.10(e), one takes

$$\begin{aligned} H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_v, A[\phi]) &\overset{6.1}{\cong} H^1(K_v, A[\phi]), \qquad \text{if } v \nmid \infty, \text{ and} \\ H^1(K_v, A[\phi]) \subset H^1(K_v, A[\phi]), & \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{if } v \mid \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for the defining subgroups. By Theorem 5.3 and Remark 5.5, the corresponding Selmer group is $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset H^1(K, A[\phi])$ (one uses Corollary 3.10 to identify $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ with a subgroup of $H^1(K, A[\phi])$ via the injection from Theorem 4.1).

In this section, building on the local analysis of Propositions 6.8 and 6.10, we investigate the relation between the two Selmer structures. We determine in Proposition 7.5(e) sufficient conditions under which they agree. In their presence, we therefore interpret the ϕ-Selmer group as a flat cohomology group. Similar considerations lead to the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5 in Theorems 7.8 and 7.10.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\phi\colon A \to B$ be an isogeny of abelian varieties over $\mathbb{R}$. Endow $A(\mathbb{R})$ and $B(\mathbb{R})$ with the real topology, and let $\phi(\mathbb{R})\colon A(\mathbb{R}) \to B(\mathbb{R})$ and $\pi_0(\phi(\mathbb{R}))\colon \pi_0(A(\mathbb{R})) \to \pi_0(B(\mathbb{R}))$ be the induced homomorphisms of commutative compact real Lie groups and their component groups. Then $\# \operatorname{Coker} \phi(\mathbb{R}) = \# \operatorname{Coker} \pi_0(\phi(\mathbb{R}))$ and $\# H^1(\mathbb{R}, A[\phi]) = \# \widehat{H}^0(\mathbb{R}, A[\phi])$, where $\widehat{H}^i$ signifies Tate cohomology groups. Both cardinalities are 1, if $\deg \phi$ is odd.*

Proof. Let $A(\mathbb{R})^0$ and $B(\mathbb{R})^0$ be the connected components of the identity of $A(\mathbb{R})$ and $B(\mathbb{R})$. Since $A(\mathbb{R})^0$ is a commutative compact real Lie group which is also connected, consideration of the exponential homomorphism gives $A(\mathbb{R})^0 \cong (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^{\dim A}$ [Bou82, §1.2]. Similar remarks apply to $B(\mathbb{R})^0$, and inspection of the dual isogeny yields the surjectivity of $\phi(\mathbb{R})^0$ in

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & A(\mathbb{R})^0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, two heads, "\phi(\mathbb{R})^0"] & A(\mathbb{R}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\phi(\mathbb{R})"] & \pi_0(A(\mathbb{R})) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_0(\phi(\mathbb{R}))"] & 0 \\ 0 \arrow[r] & B(\mathbb{R})^0 \arrow[r] & B(\mathbb{R}) \arrow[r] & \pi_0(B(\mathbb{R})) \arrow[r] & 0. \end{tikzcd}$$

The first equality now follows from snake lemma. The second one results from the periodicity of Tate cohomology and the Herbrand quotient of a finite module being 1, cf. [Ser79, VIII.§4]. For the last sentence, $H^1(\mathbb{R}, A[\phi])$ is killed by both $\# \operatorname{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) = 2$ and $\# A[\phi](\mathbb{C}) = \deg \phi$, and has $\operatorname{Coker} \phi(\mathbb{R})$ as a subgroup. ☐

Remark 7.4. Recall that $\widehat{H}^0(\mathbb{R}, A[\phi]) = \operatorname{Coker}(N_{\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}}\colon A[\phi](\mathbb{C}) \to A[\phi](\mathbb{R}))$, where $N_{\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}}$ is the norm map. Thus, Lemma 7.3 expresses $\# \operatorname{Coker} \phi(\mathbb{R})$ and $\# H^1(\mathbb{R}, A[\phi])$ in terms of quantities that are easier to compute with.

We now compare the two Selmer groups of 7.2 both quantitatively and qualitatively:

Proposition 7.5. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ has semiabelian reduction at all $v \nmid \infty$ with $\operatorname{char} \mathbb{F}_v \mid \deg \phi$.*

---

[5] We assume that $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$ only to be able to work with Galois cohomology and talk of a Selmer structure. If $\operatorname{char} K \mid \deg \phi$ and A has semiabelian reduction everywhere, the description of $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, A[\phi])$ as the subgroup obtained by imposing the local conditions $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_v, A[\phi])$ continues to hold.

(a) *Using Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 4.1 to identify* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ *with a subgroup of* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, A[\phi])$*,*

$$\# \left(\frac{\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \cap \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)} \right) \leqslant \prod_{v \nmid \infty} \frac{\# \Phi_{B,v}(\mathbb{F}_v)}{\#(\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v)},$$

$$\# \left(\frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \cap \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)} \right) \leqslant \prod_{v \nmid \infty} \frac{\# \Phi_{A,v}(\mathbb{F}_v)}{\#(\phi(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v)} \cdot \prod_{\substack{v \text{ real} \\ 2 \mid \deg \phi}} \frac{\# \widehat{H}^0(K_v, A[\phi])}{\# \operatorname{Coker} \pi_0(\phi(K_v))},$$

where the last product runs over the real places if $2 \mid \deg \phi$*, and is* 1 *if* $2 \nmid \deg \phi$ *(see also Lemma 7.3 for the notation concerning the real places).*

(b) *There is an injection*

$$\frac{\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \cap \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)} \hookrightarrow \prod_{v \nmid \infty} \left(\frac{\Phi_{B,v}}{\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v})} \right) (\mathbb{F}_v).$$

(c) *If* $\deg \phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_{B,v}$*, then* $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$*.*

(d) *If* $\deg \phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_{A,v}$ *and either* K *has no real embeddings or* $2 \nmid \deg \phi$*, then* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)$*.*

(e) *If* $\deg \phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_{A,v} c_{B,v}$*, and either* K *has no real embeddings or* $2 \nmid \deg \phi$*, then* $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) = \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)$*. If, in addition,* $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$*, then the two Selmer structures of 7.2 coincide.*

Proof.

(a) By Theorem 5.3 and Remark 5.5, $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, A[\phi])$ is cut out by local conditions $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_v, A[\phi]_{K_v})$ for $v \nmid \infty$. Similarly, $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K) \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K, A[\phi])$ is cut out by local conditions $\operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v} \subset H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(K_v, A[\phi]_{K_v})$ for all v (cf. 7.2). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \cap \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)} &\hookrightarrow \prod_{v \nmid \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v}}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \cap \operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v}}, \\ \frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi]) \cap \mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/K)} &\hookrightarrow \prod_{v} \frac{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v})}{H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) \cap \operatorname{Im} \kappa_{\phi,v}}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_v, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}) := H^1(K_v, A[\phi])$, if $v \mid \infty$. The conclusion follows from (17), Proposition 6.8(a), and Lemma 7.3.

(b) This follows from (17) and Proposition 6.8(b).

(c) This follows from (17) and Proposition 6.8(c).

(d) This follows from (17) and Proposition 6.8(d).

(e) Combine (c) and (d). The last sentence follows from Proposition 6.8(e). ☐

Remark 7.6. Analogously to how it is done in Proposition 6.8(a), the bounds of Proposition 7.5(a) can be relaxed using (13), possibly yielding right hand sides that are easier to compute in practice.

Remark 7.7. Similarly to Proposition 6.10(d) and (f), the assumptions on the local Tamagawa factors in Proposition 7.5(c), (d), and (e) can be weakened to require instead that for all $v \nmid \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\#\Phi_{B,v}(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#(\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v),\\
&\#\Phi_{A,v}(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#(\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v), \text{ and}\\
&\#\Phi_{A,v}(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#(\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#\Phi_{B,v}(\mathbb{F}_v),
\end{aligned}$$

respectively.

Theorem 7.8 (Theorems 1.5 and 1.10)**.** *Suppose that* $\operatorname{char} K > 0$ *and that*

(i) $\operatorname{char} K \nmid \deg \phi$,

(ii) $\deg \phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_{v \nmid \infty} c_{A,v} c_{B,v}$ *or, more generally (cf. Proposition 6.8(c) and (d)),*

$$\#\Phi_{A,v}(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#(\phi_v(\Phi_{A,v}))(\mathbb{F}_v) = \#\Phi_{B,v}(\mathbb{F}_v).$$

Then the ϕ*-Selmer group* $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/K) \subset H^1(K, A[\phi])$ *is determined by the* $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$*-module* $A[\phi](\overline{K})$*. In fact, it consists precisely of the everywhere unramified cohomology classes of* $H^1(K, A[\phi])$*, and* $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/K) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{A}[\phi])$ *inside* $H^1(K, A[\phi])$*.*

Proof. Indeed, due to Proposition 6.10(f), the defining subgroups for the two Selmer structures of 7.2 are given by the unramified subgroup at every place v. ☐

If L/K is a finite extension, and w is a place of L, we employ notation analogous to that introduced in the beginning of this section for the case $L = K$; namely, we replace K, v, A, B by L, w, A_L, B_L in all the definitions there. For instance, if $w \nmid \infty$, then $c_{A,w}$ and $c_{B,w}$ are the local Tamagawa factors of A_L and B_L at w (it would be more precise to write $c_{A_L,w}$ and $c_{B_L,w}$). Before proceeding to Theorem 7.10 we record a well-known lemma that will be used in the proof.

Lemma 7.9. *Let* $\mathfrak{o}$ *be a Henselian discrete valuation ring of mixed characteristic* $(0, p)$*, let* $k := \operatorname{Frac} \mathfrak{o}$*, let* e *be the absolute ramification index of* R*, and let* $\mathcal{G}$ *be a commutative finite flat* $\mathfrak{o}$*-group scheme. Assume that* $e < p - 1$*. Then* $\mathcal{G}$ *is uniquely determined by* $\mathcal{G}_K$*.*

Proof. Grouping the factors of Lemma 4.7 of l-power order together, we are reduced to the case when $\mathcal{G}$ is of prime power order. If $\mathcal{G}$ is of p-power order, this is a theorem of Raynaud [Ray74, Théorème 3.3.3]. If $\mathcal{G}$ is of prime to p order, this follows from Propositions 2.4 and A.8. ☐

Theorem 7.10 (Theorems 1.1 and 1.9)**.** *Suppose that* K *is a number field, and fix a finite extension* L/K *satisfying*

(i) A *has good reduction at all* $v \mid \deg \phi$,

(ii) $\deg \phi$ *is prime to* $\prod_{w \nmid \infty} c_{A,w} c_{B,w}$ *or, more generally (cf. Proposition 6.8(c) and (d)),*

$$\#\Phi_{A,w}(\mathbb{F}_w) = \#(\phi_w(\Phi_{A,w}))(\mathbb{F}_w) = \#\Phi_{B,w}(\mathbb{F}_w),$$

(iii) For every rational prime p *with* $p \mid \deg \phi$*, one has* $e_p < p - 1$*, where* $e_p := \max_{v \mid p} e_v$ *and* e_v *is the absolute ramification index of a nonarchimedean place* v *of* K*.*

Then the ϕ*-Selmer group* $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/L) \subset H^1(L, A[\phi])$ *is determined by the* $\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{L}/K)$*-module* $A[\phi](\overline{L})$*. In fact, the local conditions defining* $\operatorname{Sel}_\phi(A/L) \subset H^1(L, A[\phi])$ *vanish at the Archimedean places,* *and for nonarchimedean w are given by the unramified cohomology subgroup*

$$\begin{gathered} H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(L_w, A[\phi]) \subset H^1(L_w, A[\phi]), \text{ if } w \nmid \deg\phi, \text{ and by} \\ H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_w, \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}) \overset{(16)}{\subset} H^1(L_w, A[\phi]), \text{ if } w \mid \deg\phi, \end{gathered} \tag{18}$$

where in the latter case $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$ is determined by the $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/K)$-module $A[\phi](\overline{L})$, because if $w \mid v$, then $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is the unique commutative finite flat $\mathcal{O}_v$-group scheme with the generic fiber $A[\phi]_{K_v}$.

Moreover, let $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{B}'$ be the homomorphism induced by ϕ between the Néron models of A and B over $\mathcal{O}_L$, and let $\mathcal{A}'[\phi]$ be its kernel. Then $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{A}'[\phi])$ inside $H^1(L, A[\phi])$.

Proof. It suffices to show that the two Selmer structures of 7.2 on the $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{L}/L)$-module $A[\phi](\overline{L})$ coincide, and that their common defining subgroups are as claimed (namely, given by (18) for $w \nmid \infty$).

For $w \mid \infty$, both defining subgroups vanish because (iii) implies that $2 \nmid \deg\phi$.

For $w \nmid \infty$, the two defining subgroups $\mathrm{Im}\,\kappa_{\phi,w}, H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_w, \mathcal{A}'[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}) \subset H^1(L_w, A[\phi])$ coincide by Proposition 6.8(a). By 7.2, this already gives $\mathrm{Sel}_\phi(A/L) = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{A}'[\phi])$.

For $w \nmid \infty$ and $w \nmid \deg\phi$, by Propositions 2.3 and 6.10(f),

$$\mathrm{Im}\,\kappa_{\phi,w} = H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}_w, \mathcal{A}'[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}) = H^1_{\mathrm{nr}}(L_w, A[\phi]).$$

For $w \mid \deg\phi$, to finish the proof we need to show that $\mathcal{A}'[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w} = \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$, and that, if $w \mid v$, then $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ has the claimed uniqueness property. The latter follows from Lemma 7.9, once we argue that $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v} \to \mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}_v$ is finite flat. By Proposition 2.3, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}_v} \xrightarrow{\phi_{\mathcal{O}_v}} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is the isogeny induced by ϕ on the Néron models over $\mathcal{O}_v$; hence, $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is its kernel, which is proper because so is $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}_v} \to \mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}_v$. Thus, by Corollary 3.10 and [EGA IV$_3$, 8.11.1], $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ is finite flat. As for $\mathcal{A}'[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w} = \mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$, by Proposition 2.3, $\mathcal{A}'[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w}$ is the kernel of the homomorphism induced by ϕ on the Néron models over $\mathcal{O}_w$. So is $\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_w} = (\mathcal{A}[\phi]_{\mathcal{O}_v})_{\mathcal{O}_w}$, because $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{O}_v}$ are proper, so, by Proposition 2.4, their base changes to $\mathcal{O}_w$ are also Néron models. ☐

Appendix A.

Let S be a scheme. For convenience of the reader we recall several well-known general facts from algebraic geometry, mostly concerned with S-group algebraic spaces and their torsors.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a Henselian local ring, let $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}$ an ideal, and let X be a smooth $\mathcal{O}$-algebraic space. If X is not a scheme, assume that it is quasi-separated. Then the natural map $X(\mathcal{O}) \to X(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$ is surjective.*

Proof. We include a proof for the lack of reference. Assume that $\mathfrak{a} \neq \mathcal{O}$, let o be the closed point of $\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}$ (or of $\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a}$), and fix a $b \in X(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$ which we want to lift to a $B \in X(\mathcal{O})$.

Assume that X is a scheme. By the local structure theorem for smooth morphisms [BLR90, §2.2 Proposition 11] applied at $b(o)$, we can assume that $X \to \mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}$ factors through $X \xrightarrow{u} \mathbb{A}^n_{\mathcal{O}}$ with u étale and separated. We can lift $u \circ b \in \mathbb{A}^n_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$ to a $c \in \mathbb{A}^n_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{O})$ and hence reduce to X being étale and separated over $\mathcal{O}$. In this case, by [EGA IV$_4$, 18.5.11 (c) and 18.5.15], one takes $B \in X(\mathcal{O})$ to be the unique section with $B(o) = b(o)$.

In the general case, by [LMB00, 6.3], $b|_o$ lifts to a $c \in U(o)$ with U a smooth X-scheme. By the surjectivity in the scheme case, $c \in (U \times_{X,b} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})(o)$ gives rise to a lift $d \in U(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a})$ of b. Since U is a smooth $\mathcal{O}$-scheme, d lifts to a $D \in U(\mathcal{O})$ and one takes $B \in X(\mathcal{O})$ to be the image of D. ☐

Proposition A.2. *Let $j\colon S_{\mathrm{fppf}} \to S_{\text{ét}}$ be the canonical morphism of sites. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a smooth commutative S-group algebraic space. If $\mathcal{G}$ is not a scheme, assume that it is quasi-separated.*

(a) Then $\mathbf{R}^n j_* \mathcal{G} = 0$ for $n \geqslant 1$, and the natural maps $H^i_{\text{ét}}(S, j_*\mathcal{G}) \to H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ are isomorphisms.

(b) If $S = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}$ with $\mathcal{O}$ a Henselian local ring with residue field k, then the δ-functorial cohomology pullback maps $H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{G}) \to H^i_{\mathrm{fppf}}(k, \mathcal{G}_k)$ are isomorphisms for $i \geqslant 1$.

Proof. One invokes [Gro68, 11.1 et 11.7] with $U = \mathcal{G}$, using Lemma A.1 to check condition (L). When (R) in loc. cit. is modified by assuming U to be representable by a smooth algebraic space containing the zero section, the proofs continue to work with the following caveats:

1. In 11.4 one assumes in addition that $X_0 \neq \varnothing$.
2. On p. 175, $\underline{C}^i(U)$ is a smooth X-algebraic space by [SP, Proposition 05YF and Lemma 04AM].
3. On p. 177, the required quasi-coherence of N is argued as follows: let $a\colon X_0 \to U$ be the zero section; by [SP, Lemma 061C and Remark 061D], in the notation of loc. cit., $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{X_0}}(a^*\Omega_{U/X}, \mathcal{C}_{X_0/X}) \cong N$, and the conclusion follows from [SP, Lemmas 05ZF and 03M1].
4. To obtain 11.7 2°) and 3°) one assumes in addition that (L) and (R) hold for every Henselian (but not necessarily strictly Henselian) local X-scheme $\overline{X}$. ☐

A.3. H^1 **and torsors.** Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an S-group algebraic space, and suppose that $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is fppf. Recall that if $\mathcal{G}$ is commutative, then the elements of the cohomology groups $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ can be put in bijective correspondence with fppf torsors $\mathcal{T}$ under $\mathcal{G}$, under which the trivial torsor corresponds to the identity element, and the cohomology pullback maps for $i = 1$ identify with the base change of torsors: $\mathcal{T} \mapsto \mathcal{T} \times_S S'$ (cf. [Gir71, III.3.5.4, III.2.4.2, III.2.4.5 et V.1.5.3]). Thus, without the commutativity assumption, one writes $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ for the set of isomorphism classes of fppf torsors under $\mathcal{G}$, and understands that $H^1_{\mathrm{fppf}}(S, \mathcal{G})$ is functorial in S by base change.

Proposition A.4. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an S-group algebraic space, and suppose that $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is fppf. Then any fppf torsor $\mathcal{T}$ under $\mathcal{G}$ is representable by an fppf S-algebraic space.*

Proof. Since being an S-algebraic space is fppf local [SP, Lemma 04SK], $\mathcal{T}$ is an S-algebraic space. Similarly, being fppf is fppf local on the base [SP, Lemmas 041Q, 041W, 041T], so $\mathcal{T} \to S$ is fppf. ☐

Proposition A.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an S-group algebraic space, and suppose that $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is smooth. Then any fppf torsor $\mathcal{T}$ under $\mathcal{G}$ trivializes over an étale cover of S.*

Proof. By Proposition A.4 and [SP, Lemmas 0429 and 041Q], $\mathcal{T}$ is a smooth surjective S-algebraic space. Since $\mathcal{T}$ trivializes over $\mathcal{T} \to S$, it also trivializes over an étale cover of $\mathcal{T}$ by a scheme U. Since $U \to S$ has a section étale locally [EGA IV$_4$, 17.16.3 (ii)], we conclude. ☐

Proposition A.6. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an S-group scheme, and suppose that $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is fppf and quasi-affine* [EGA II, 5.1.1]. *Then every fppf torsor $\mathcal{T}$ under $\mathcal{G}$ is representable by a quasi-affine scheme.*

Proof. By [SP, Lemma 0247] and [EGA IV$_2$, 2.7.1 (xiv)], a morphism of sheaves $\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{f} S$ on S_{fppf}, which fppf locally on S is representable and quasi-affine, is representable and quasi-affine. ☐

Proposition A.7. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a separated quasi-finite* [EGA II, 6.2.3] *flat S-group scheme. Then $\mathcal{G} \to S$ is quasi-affine; it is also fppf, if S is Noetherian. In the latter case, every fppf torsor $\mathcal{T}$ under $\mathcal{G}$ is representable by a scheme.*

Proof. Every separated quasi-finite morphism is quasi-affine [EGA IV$_4$, 18.12.12] and is also of finite presentation, if S is Noetherian. The last sentence now follows from Proposition A.6. ☐

Proposition A.8. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a quasi-finite fppf S-group scheme whose fibers have orders that are prime to the residue characteristic. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is étale.*

Proof. This is [TO70, p. 17, Lemma 5] if $\mathcal{G}$ is finite. In general the proof is the same: by [EGA IV$_4$, 17.6.2 a) $\Leftrightarrow$ c$''$)] one is reduced to S being the spectrum of an algebraically closed field, in which case $\mathcal{G}$ is finite. One then uses the connected-étale sequence. ☐

A.9. Quotients by equivalence relations. Let R and X be sheaves on S_{fppf}. Recall [Ray67, §3] that $R \xrightarrow{\delta} X \times_S X$ is an *equivalence relation*, if δ is a monomorphism and $\delta(T)$ is a graph of an equivalence relation on $X(T)$ for each S-scheme T. Form the fppf quotient sheaf Y by the equivalence relation; by abuse of notation, $Y = X/R$. By loc. cit., the quotient is

(a) *Effective*, meaning that the canonical map $R \to X \times_Y X$ is an isomorphism;

(b) *Universal*, meaning that for any morphism of fppf sheaves $Y' \to Y$, the quotient of $X \times_Y Y'$ by the base changed equivalence relation $R \times_Y Y'$ is Y'.

The main case of interest in this paper is when $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G}$ is an immersion of S-group schemes, $X = \mathcal{G}$, $R = \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{H}$, and $\delta\colon \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G}$ is $(g,h) \mapsto (g, gh)$; the corresponding quotient is $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$.

Lemma A.10. *Let $\mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{G}$ be an immersion of S-group algebraic spaces, and let $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ be the fppf quotient sheaf. Assume that $\delta\colon \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G}$ given by $(g,h) \mapsto (g, gh)$ is quasi-compact.*

(a) If $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is fppf, then $\mathcal{Q}$ is a quasi-separated S-algebraic space.

(b) Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a property of morphisms of algebraic spaces that is stable under base change and is fppf local on the base. If $\mathcal{H} \to S$ has $\mathcal{P}$, then so does $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{Q}$.

(c) If $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is fppf, and i is a closed immersion, then $\mathcal{Q}$ is a separated S-algebraic space.

Proof.

(a) Let p_1, p_2 be the projections of $\mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G}$. By [LMB00, 10.4], it suffices to check that $p_1 \circ \delta$ and $p_2 \circ \delta$ are fppf. This is so because both are base changes of $\mathcal{H} \to S$.

(b) In the proof of [Ray67, Proposition 2] replace schemes by algebraic spaces and fpqc by fppf.

(c) We check that $\mathcal{Q} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{Q} \times_S \mathcal{Q}$ is a closed immersion. By A.9(a), the square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{H} \arrow[r, "\delta"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G} \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{Q} \arrow[r, "\Delta"] & \mathcal{Q} \times_S \mathcal{Q}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is Cartesian. Since $\mathcal{H} \to S$ is fppf, by (b) and [SP, Lemmas 041Q, 041W, 041T], so is $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, $\mathcal{G} \times_S \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{Q} \times_S \mathcal{Q}$ is also fppf, and Δ is a closed immersion, because so is δ [SP, Lemma 0420] being a base change of i. ☐

A.11. Fpqc covers. To carry out descent we sometimes consider fpqc morphisms. For us a morphism is *fpqc*, if it is faithfully flat and quasi-compact. In the notation of 2.1, by [EGA I, $\mathbf{0}_{\text{I}}$ 7.3.5] and [EGA IV$_4$, 18.6.6 (iii)], $\operatorname{Spec} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ and $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^h_{S,s} \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{S,s}$ are fpqc.

References

[Abr87] V. A. Abrashkin, *Galois modules of group schemes of period p over the ring of Witt vectors*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **51** (1987), no. 4, 691–736, 910 (Russian); English transl., Math. USSR-Izv. **31** (1988), no. 1, 1–46. MR914857 (89a:14062)

[BBM82] Pierre Berthelot, Lawrence Breen, and William Messing, *Théorie de Dieudonné cristalline. II*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 930, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982 (French). MR667344 (85k:14023)

[BK90] Spencer Bloch and Kazuya Kato, *L-functions and Tamagawa numbers of motives*, The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. I, Progr. Math., vol. 86, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 333–400. MR1086888 (92g:11063)

[Bou64] N. Bourbaki, *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXX. Algèbre commutative. Chapitre 5: Entiers. Chapitre 6: Valuations*, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1308, Hermann, Paris, 1964 (French). MR0194450 (33 #2660)

[Bou82] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Éléments de mathématique: groupes et algèbres de Lie*, Masson, Paris, 1982 (French). Chapitre 9. Groupes de Lie réels compacts. [Chapter 9. Compact real Lie groups]. MR682756 (84i:22001)

[BLR90] Siegfried Bosch, Werner Lütkebohmert, and Michel Raynaud, *Néron models*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 21, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. MR1045822 (91i:14034)

[Cas65] J. W. S. Cassels, *Arithmetic on curves of genus 1. VIII. On conjectures of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **217** (1965), 180–199. MR0179169 (31 #3420)

[EGA I] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. I. Le langage des schémas*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **4** (1960), 228. MR0217083 (36 #177a)

[EGA II] ———, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. II. Étude globale élémentaire de quelques classes de morphismes*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **8** (1961), 222 (French). MR0163909 (29 #1208)

[EGA IV_2] ———, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. II*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **24** (1965), 231 (French). MR0199181 (33 #7330)

[EGA IV_3] ———, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **28** (1966), 255. MR0217086 (36 #178)

[EGA IV_4] ———, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas IV*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **32** (1967), 361 (French). MR0238860 (39 #220)

[Fal83] G. Faltings, *Endlichkeitssätze für abelsche Varietäten über Zahlkörpern*, Invent. Math. **73** (1983), no. 3, 349–366, DOI 10.1007/BF01388432 (German). MR718935 (85g:11026a)

[Fon85] Jean-Marc Fontaine, *Il n'y a pas de variété abélienne sur* **Z**, Invent. Math. **81** (1985), no. 3, 515–538, DOI 10.1007/BF01388584 (French). MR807070 (87g:11073)

[Gir71] Jean Giraud, *Cohomologie non abélienne*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971 (French). Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 179. MR0344253 (49 #8992)

[Gro68] Alexander Grothendieck, *Le groupe de Brauer. III. Exemples et compléments*, Dix Exposés sur la Cohomologie des Schémas, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968, pp. 88–188 (French). MR0244271 (39 #5586c)

[Kra99] Alain Kraus, *On the equation $x^p + y^q = z^r$: a survey*, Ramanujan J. **3** (1999), no. 3, 315–333, DOI 10.1023/A:1009835521324. MR1714945 (2001f:11046)

[Lan56] Serge Lang, *Algebraic groups over finite fields*, Amer. J. Math. **78** (1956), 555–563. MR0086367 (19,174a)

[Liu02] Qing Liu, *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 6, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002. Translated from the French by Reinie Erné; Oxford Science Publications. MR1917232 (2003g:14001)

[LMB00] Gérard Laumon and Laurent Moret-Bailly, *Champs algébriques*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 39, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000 (French). MR1771927 (2001f:14006)

[Maz72] Barry Mazur, *Rational points of abelian varieties with values in towers of number fields*, Invent. Math. **18** (1972), 183–266. MR0444670 (56 #3020)

[McC86] William G. McCallum, *Duality theorems for Néron models*, Duke Math. J. **53** (1986), no. 4, 1093–1124, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-86-05354-8. MR874683 (88c:14062)

[Mil80] James S. Milne, *Étale cohomology*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 33, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1980. MR559531 (81j:14002)

[Mil06] J. S. Milne, *Arithmetic duality theorems*, 2nd ed., BookSurge, LLC, Charleston, SC, 2006. MR2261462 (2007e:14029)

[MR07] Barry Mazur and Karl Rubin, *Finding large Selmer rank via an arithmetic theory of local constants*, Ann. of Math. (2) **166** (2007), no. 2, 579–612, DOI 10.4007/annals.2007.166.579. MR2373150 (2009a:11127)

[MR12] ———, *Selmer companion curves*, preprint (2012). `http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.0620`.

[NSW08] Jürgen Neukirch, Alexander Schmidt, and Kay Wingberg, *Cohomology of number fields*, 2nd ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 323, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. MR2392026 (2008m:11223)

[Ols06] Martin C. Olsson, $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}$*-stacks and restriction of scalars*, Duke Math. J. **134** (2006), no. 1, 139–164, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-06-13414-2. MR2239345 (2007f:14002)

[Ray67] M. Raynaud, *Passage au quotient par une relation d'équivalence plate*, Proc. Conf. Local Fields (Driebergen, 1966), Springer, Berlin, 1967, pp. 78–85 (French). MR0232781 (38 #1104)

[Ray70] Michel Raynaud, *Faisceaux amples sur les schémas en groupes et les espaces homogènes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 119, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970 (French). MR0260758 (41 #5381)

[Ray74] ———, *Schémas en groupes de type* $(p, \ldots, p)$, Bull. Soc. Math. France **102** (1974), 241–280 (French). MR0419467 (54 #7488)

[SS04] Edward F. Schaefer and Michael Stoll, *How to do a p-descent on an elliptic curve*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356** (2004), no. 3, 1209–1231 (electronic), DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03366-X. MR2021618 (2004g:11045)

[Ser79] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Local fields*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 67, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1979. Translated from the French by Marvin Jay Greenberg. MR554237 (82e:12016)

[SGA 3_{I}] Philippe Gille and Patrick Polo (eds.), *Schémas en groupes (SGA 3). Tome I. Propriétés générales des schémas en groupes*, Documents Mathématiques (Paris) [Mathematical Documents (Paris)], 7, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2011 (French). Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1962–64. [Algebraic Geometry Seminar of Bois Marie 1962–64]; A seminar directed by M. Demazure and A. Grothendieck with the collaboration of M. Artin, J.-E. Bertin, P. Gabriel, M. Raynaud and J-P. Serre; Revised and annotated edition of the 1970 French original. MR2867621

[SP] *The Stacks Project*. `http://stacks.math.columbia.edu`.

[Swa98] Richard G. Swan, *Néron-Popescu desingularization*, Algebra and geometry (Taipei, 1995), Lect. Algebra Geom., vol. 2, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998, pp. 135–192. MR1697953 (2000h:13006)

[Tat66] John Tate, *Endomorphisms of abelian varieties over finite fields*, Invent. Math. **2** (1966), 134–144. MR0206004 (34 #5829)

[Tat76] ———, *Relations between* K_2 *and Galois cohomology*, Invent. Math. **36** (1976), 257–274. MR0429837 (55 #2847)

[Tat97] ———, *Finite flat group schemes*, Modular forms and Fermat's last theorem (Boston, MA, 1995), Springer, New York, 1997, pp. 121–154. MR1638478

[TO70] John Tate and Frans Oort, *Group schemes of prime order*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **3** (1970), 1–21. MR0265368 (42 #278)

[Zar85] Yu. G. Zarhin, *A finiteness theorem for unpolarized abelian varieties over number fields with prescribed places of bad reduction*, Invent. Math. **79** (1985), no. 2, 309–321, DOI 10.1007/BF01388976. MR778130 (86d:14041)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4307, USA

E-mail address: `kestutis@math.mit.edu`

URL: `http://math.mit.edu/~kestutis/`